

# LETTERS

TO THE

RIGHT HON. EDWARD CARDWELL, M.P.,

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND.

---

## LETTER I.

SIR—Twenty-eight years ago, and in this month, one of your most distinguished predecessors in the Irish Secretaryship, was engaged upon the very subject which, at present, occupies the serious attention of the Irish Government and the Irish people—namely, POPULAR EDUCATION. The circumstances of the country, political and social, are widely different, in September, 1859, from what they were in September, 1831, nevertheless, no statesmen, when called on to abolish an existing System of Education, and to aid in introducing another in its stead, can wisely exclude from consideration the state of popular feeling which first created that system, accepted it as an experiment, and now, unequivocally, condemns its working, as vicious, and a failure. Like your predecessor, Lord Stanley, in 1831, an entire stranger to the country, and only a few months in office, you are asked to abolish one system of Education and to introduce another, although your own knowledge of the subject must, at best, be comparatively limited; and, the Cabinet containing no Irishman, her Majesty's present Ministers can, it is to be feared, render you little assistance in the onerous task. Having devoted my life to the practical working and direction of Popular Education in Ireland, thoroughly acquainted with the principles and working of the various systems in operation, both here and in Great Britain, and having laboured long, and not unsuccessfully, to influence public opinion upon this great subject, I beg leave, Sir, respectfully, to lay before you, in a few public Letters, a fair, and, I trust, clear statement of the general outlines of the question. The subject may be discussed from three points of view—the religious, the educational, and the political; and, although it is impossible to consider it from any one of these, so as wholly to exclude the influence of the others, I shall not fail to confine the discussion, as far as possible, to those separate views of the subject now indicated. As a citizen, I claim the right to submit my views to my fellow-countrymen and to the Government, and enjoying, as I had done for twenty-five years, the bounty of the State, I come to lay briefly before it the tribute of the experience acquired, during that service. In doing so, I alone am responsible, for the opinions and statements which I may advance, for, although I have reason to believe that those opinions

are shared in by the great majority of the people of Ireland, I am not authorized to, nor do I advance them on behalf of any one but myself. To you, Sir—to the deservedly popular and highly esteemed nobleman at the head of the Irish Government, and to her Majesty's Ministers, I beg leave to express my profound respect, and to assure you that, as the fair settlement of the Education Question is my sole object, I shall studiously avoid the introduction of any topic which could, in any way, be foreign to its discussion on general and statesmanlike grounds.

The Resolutions of the Catholic Hierarchy, unanimously agreed to at their recent Synod, held last month, are in your hands, and they embody the clear demand of the Catholic Prelates upon the important question of Education.

The British Press, generally, and some portion of the Irish Press, have exceeded the limits of truth, decency, and respect for popular feeling, in their treatment of this Ecclesiastical Document. Their gross abuse—as in the *Morning Post* and other journals—of the venerated heads of the Catholic Church in Ireland cannot, Sir, have your sympathy, and, therefore, I dismiss this portion of the attack. They charge the Prelates,

(1) With inconsistency, because they now oppose a System of Education to which, heretofore, they gave tolerance ;

(2) With aggressive pretensions upon the rights of the laity, and a demand for absolute control over Education ; and

(3) With claiming to exclude the State from all control over Popular Education, the Bishops demanding the setting aside of a portion of the funds for Education, the exclusive appropriation of which they claim.

The Resolutions of the Bishops need neither explanation nor exposition. Their clearness and elegance of style, their accuracy of statement, and their logical order render interpretation unnecessary. The history of our Education Question, appearing, however, to be wholly unknown in Great Britain, and comparatively unknown in Ireland, my first effort will be to give a condensed outline of its more prominent political features, as ignorance of this history is the chief cause of many of the absurd and unfounded charges, now advanced against the present Resolutions of the Catholic Bishops.

In the reign of Henry the VIII., no less than one thousand literary institutions, connected, in general, with monastic and religious establishments, were destroyed. To the work of spoliation and confiscation of Church property was soon added that of most severe penal laws against all Catholic education, and the statutes of James I., William and Mary, Anne, and George I., afford sufficient examples of the barbarous severity of this code. These were the effectual means devised to prevent the education of Catholics, and out of which, when relaxed, grew up a system less infamous in degree only—namely, that of proselytising, through improper agencies, and unworthy motives. The Parish School Act of 1537, the Diocesan Free Schools, in 1570 ; Trinity College, in 1591 ; the Royal Free Schools, in 1605 ; the Schools of Erasmus Smith, in 1669 ; the Blue Coat Hospital Schools, in 1672 ; and the Charter Schools, in 1733, were all founded with the same object—to make the native Irish Protestant in

faith, and English in feeling. Primate Boulter, in 1730, suggested the Charter schools; and although the Penal Code had then been fifty years in full operation, he thus writes:—

“I can assure you the Papists are here so numerous that it highly concerns us, in point of interest, as well as out of concern for the salvation of these poor creatures, who are our fellow-subjects, to try all possible means to bring them and theirs over to the knowledge of the true religion; and one of the most likely methods we can think of is, if possible, instructing and converting the young generation; for, instead of converting those that are adult, we are daily losing many of our meaner people, who go off to Popery.”

In ninety-three years, this gigantic swindle spent £1,600,000 of the public money upon 12,000 children, the inhumanity, immorality, and barbarity of whose training excited the exposure and denunciations of the benevolent Howard, and eventually led to the suppression of this infamous system. The Hibernian Military School, in 1769; the Hibernian Marine School, in 1775; the Female Orphan School, in 1790; the Association for Discountenancing Vice, in 1792; the London Hibernian Society, in 1806; the Kildare Place Society, in 1811; the Institution for the Education of the Deaf and Dumb, and the Lord-Lieutenant's School Fund, in 1819, were all founded for, or directed towards, the two objects already stated. Apart from the spoliated Church property, and 10,000 acres of the confiscated estates in Ulster, upwards of three millions of the public money was expended on these projects.

In 1758, or only a century since, a statute of George II. permitted Catholics to keep school, and, in 1792, they were admitted to Trinity College, and to the Bar, and privileged to keep school, without a license from the Protestant bishop. The vast mass of the Catholic people, the peasantry, and working classes, received the rudiments of education in private schools, but, from the beginning of the present century, Catholic Parochial Schools and establishments under the Religious orders—Nuns and Monks—gradually increased in number. Although Catholic children, through the influence of Protestant landlords and others, and owing to the absence of other means of education, attended many schools connected with some of the societies enumerated, the Kildare Place Society, founded in 1811, was the first of those bodies that relaxed the rigid enforcement of unmitigated Protestantism upon the Catholic conscience. This Society, which originated with a few Quakers, supplemented its private subscriptions by an Annual Parliamentary Grant, recommended by the Royal Commissioners of 1812, first granted in 1819, and continued until 1830. The principle of the Society was:—

“The admission of pupils, uninfluenced by religious distinctions, and the reading of the Bible or Testament, without note or comment, by all the pupils who had attained suitable proficiency, excluding Catechisms and Controversial Treatises; the Bible or Testament not to be used as a class-book, from which children should learn to read and spell.”

Upon a pledge given to carry out, in practice, the recommendation of the Royal Commissioners of 1812,

“That no attempt would be made to influence or disturb the peculiar religious tenets of any sect or description of Christians,”

a Parliamentary Grant was made to the Society in 1819; and, on the



faith of this pledge, the toleration and moderate support of many of the Catholic Bishops were obtained. The reading of the Douay Testament, under a Catholic teacher, as the only condition demanded upon which Government aid might be obtained for a Catholic school, seemed a great boon, after emerging from the horrors of the Penal Code. Then, in the case of Protestant schools, the Catholic children might read either from the Authorised or from the Douay Version of the Testament, and although the teacher might be a Protestant, no note, comment, or question—oral or written—beyond the *Dictionary meaning* of the words, was permitted. The prohibition as to catechisms, &c., applied to their use for proselytising purposes, not at all to their proper use; as not only in all Catholic, but in numbers of Protestant schools, the Catholic children learned their own catechism, before or after the hours of ordinary or common instruction. Comparing this System, the principle upon which it was founded, and the solemn pledge which guaranteed its observance, there can be no question of its superiority over the present National system, as a protection to Catholics. Then, as now, however, the Catholics trusted but to be betrayed, as, like the present National system, the principle was gradually departed from, and it was soon found that, in practice, in all mixed schools, under Protestant Patrons, the Society became converted into a huge engine of proselytizing.

Having thus, Sir, sketched, in outline, the several educational institutions existing up to 1826, I pray your most serious attention to the political crisis at which we have now arrived. In July, 1825, the new Catholic Association was formed, which declared that—

“The second purpose of the New Catholic Association is, and shall be, the encouragement and extension of a liberal, enlightened, and *religious* system of education, founded on the basis of Christian charity and perfect fair dealing.”

And the next purpose was—

“To ascertain the number of children of each persuasion undergoing a course of education in the schools.”

Here was a great and powerful organization, created by the political circumstances of the period, embracing both clergy and laity, and we thus see the prominence which education occupied amongst its leading objects. The Catholic wardens of every parish were required to make a monthly report to the Association, one of the returns in which was—

“The number of schools in the parish, and how supported—and whether on liberal principles, or on those of the Kildare place, or other improper plan.”

From 1824 to 1826, Royal Commissioners were engaged in an Inquiry into the working of the several Educational Institutions in Ireland; and overtures having been made to the Catholic Prelates that his Majesty's Government—the Marquess of Wellesley, Lord Lieutenant, and Mr. Goulburn, Chief Secretary—was anxious to treat with them, on fair terms, upon the subject of Education, the proposition was considered, at a meeting of the entire of the Catholic Bishops in January, 1826. A minute comparison of the important Resolutions then unanimously passed by all the Prelates, with those recently submitted to you by the Catholic Hierarchy, cannot fail to possess deep interest. It will prove to you, Sir,

that the principles of the Catholic Church are immutable, in the essential matters of Education, and that the "Hereditary Bondsmen" of 1826 enunciated the same sentiments, and in bolder terms, than the emancipated Prelates of 1859. The Resolutions of 1826 were drawn up not only as a moderate, but as the *minimum* demand of Catholic rights, in the matter of State Education, for "we will," say the thirty Bishops, "withhold our concurrence, in our respective dioceses, from any system of Education which will not fully accord with the principles expressed in the foregoing Resolutions."

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS OF IRELAND, UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

"Jan. 1826.

I. "Having considered, attentively, a plan of National Education which has been submitted to us—Resolved, that the admission of Protestants and Roman Catholics into the same schools, for the purpose of literary instruction, may, under existing circumstances, be allowed, *provided sufficient care be taken to protect the religion of the Roman Catholic children, and to furnish them with adequate means of religious instruction.*

II. "That, in order to secure sufficient protection to the religion of Roman Catholic children, under such a system of education, we deem it necessary that the Master of each school, in which the majority of the pupils profess the Roman Catholic faith, be a Roman Catholic; and that in schools in which the Roman Catholic children form only a minority, a permanent Roman Catholic Assistant be employed; and that such Master and Assistant be appointed upon the recommendation, or with the express approval of the Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese in which they are to be employed; and, further, that they, or either of them, be removed upon the representation of such Bishop. The same rule to be observed for the appointment or dismissal of Mistresses and Assistants in female schools.

III. "That we consider it improper that Masters and Mistresses intended for the religious instruction of Roman Catholic youth, should be trained or educated by, or under the control of, persons professing a different faith; and that we conceive it most desirable that a male and female Model School shall be established in each province in Ireland, to be supported at the public expense, for the purpose of qualifying such masters and mistresses for the important duties which they shall be appointed to discharge.

"Aug. 1859.

I. "That schools for Catholic youth should be such as to *insure for them the benefit of a safe secular education, and adequate religious instruction in the faith and practice, of the Catholic Church.* They should be, therefore, so subordinated to Bishops in their respective dioceses, as that no Books may be used in them for secular instruction to which the Ordinary shall object: and that the Teachers, both as to appointment and removal, and the selection of all Books *for religious instruction, and the arrangements for it, be under the control of the same Ordinary.*

II. "That the principles enunciated can be adequately embodied and acted upon in this country only on a system of education *exclusively for Catholics.*

III. "That the Catholics of Ireland have a right to obtain such a proportion of the aid annually allocated by Parliament for Education, as, regard being had to their numbers and the condition of the Catholic population, will suffice for the establishment and maintenance of schools to be conducted on thoroughly Catholic principles.

IV. "That the concession of grants for exclusively Catholic schools in Great Britain and in the British Colonies, is conclusive evidence of the fairness of the claim to a grant being made for Catholic schools in Ireland; and that the Catholic people of Ireland should, therefore, insist, through their representatives in Parliament, and by direct application to the Government, on obtaining such a grant.

V. "That the National System of Education, though *tolerated on account of the particular circumstances of the country,* must be, from its very nature, in several respects, objectionable to Catholics; and that the changes made in its Rules, from time to time, having been adverse to

IV. "That, in conformity with the principle of protecting the religion of Roman Catholic children, the Books intended for their particular instruction in religion, shall be selected, or approved by the Roman Catholic Prelates; and that no Book or Tract, for common instruction in literature, shall be introduced into any school in which Roman Catholic children are educated, which Book or Tract may be objected to, *on religious grounds*, by the Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese in which such school is established.

V. "That a transfer of the property in several schools which now exist, or may hereafter exist in Ireland, may be utterly impracticable, from the nature of the tenure by which they are, or shall hereafter be held: and from the number of persons having a legal interest in them, as well as from a variety of other causes; and that, in our opinion, any regulation which should require such transfer to be made, as a necessary condition for receiving parliamentary support, would operate to the exclusion of many useful schools from all participation in the public bounty.

VI. "That, appointed as we have been by Divine Providence to watch over and preserve the deposit of the Catholic Faith in Ireland; and responsible as we are to God for the souls of our flocks, we will, in our respective dioceses, withhold our concurrence and support from any system of education which will not fully accord with the principles expressed in the foregoing Resolutions.

7. "The Rule, adopted, some years ago, by the Board, according to which aid has been, since its adoption, refused for the erection or outfit of schools unless the school estate be vested in the Board—a condition expressly at variance with the instructions of the Holy See and the decision of the Catholic Bishops of Ireland, in the National and Provincial Synods.

8. "The inherent evil in the system that the Schools are all liable to inspection by *Protestant* Officers of the Board, and the fact that Schools exclusively attended by Catholics, are, to a vast extent, exclusively under *Protestant Inspection*.

9. "The fact that in Schools deriving aid from the Board, Catholic children have received, and may receive Religious Instruction from Protestant Teachers, in opposition to the original constitution, as laid down by Lord Stanley—the Commissioners not recognizing the rightful claims of Catholic Pastors to be the guardians of the religion of Catholic youth, in attendance at National Schools."

This comparison affords a complete and triumphant answer, Sir, to the British Press, who, either through ignorance or malice, charge the Catholic Prelates with advancing new and aggressive demands, in their recent Resolutions. Any difference that exists between the two series of Resolutions is accounted for by the difference in the facts and circumstances upon which they had to decide.

Catholic interests, have increased the distrust of the Catholic Episcopacy.

1. "That we signalize, as especially objectionable, the non-recognition of the control over education which the Catholic Church holds to have been conferred on Bishops by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, when He said to His Apostles: 'Go, teach all nations'—*Matt.*, xxviii. 19.

2. "The practical substitution in its stead, of the control of a Board consisting of members of different religious denominations, predominantly Protestant, and deriving its authority exclusively from the State, whilst its power extends to and is exercised in matters vitally affecting religion.

3. "The education of Catholic teachers in the Model or Normal schools, even in History and Philosophy, and of children in other schools, by Protestants.

4. "The constitution, generally, of the Model and Training schools, and their establishment throughout the country, in opposition, in many cases, to the declared opinions of the local Bishops.

5. "The exclusion from the schools of the Cross, and of all symbols of Catholic devotion.

6. "The character of several of the books published by the Commissioners, the use of which is enforced in the schools under their immediate management, and is practically unavoidable in schools deriving aid from the Board.



These Resolutions, of 1826, were submitted to the Government, and the late Most Rev. Dr. Murray at once transmitted them, through the present Earl of Fingall, to the New Catholic Association, in which, on being presented, they met, as might be supposed, with unanimous approbation. Thus were the Clergy and Laity of one mind, upon this momentous question; thus did that great political organization narrowly watch over the vital training of the mind and future manhood of Ireland; thus were Faith and Nationality one and indivisible, with our fathers. The Catholic Book Society rose to compile safe works for youth; the Catholic Association aided schools in poor localities, and voted £1,500 for a Model school in Dublin, and Clergy and Laity denounced the proselytising schemes of the Kildare-place Society. The Monarch and the Minister alike sworn to deny them political emancipation, that great boon in the gift of a Protestant Parliament alone, and largely dependent on Protestant opinion to enable them to carry it, the Catholics of that day knew not what it was to palter with the sacred trust of the education of their children, though they might forfeit political support, and postpone their own political manumission—the affectionate blandishments of some, the bribes of many, and the threats of others were, alike, rejected or despised; to the proselytisers, one and all, they said—

“Heap heavier still the fetters; bar closer still the grate;  
Patient as sheep we yield us up unto your cruel hate.  
But by the Shades beneath us, and by the Gods above,  
Add not unto your cruel hate, your yet more cruel love!”

How easily they crushed Kildare-place Society, and got your predecessor, Lord Stanley, to introduce the National System, and how the Catholics of Ireland can, far more readily, enable you, Sir, to act as noble a part, in complying with the present just demand of the Catholic Prelates and Catholic people, will form the subject of a future letter.—I have the honour to remain, Sir, your very obedient servant,

JAMES W. KAVANAGH.

23rd September, 1859.

---

## LETTER II.

SIR—In my last letter, I gave a general outline of the several educational institutions founded in Ireland, from the time of Henry VIII. up to the establishment of the Kildare-place Society, in 1811. I pointed out the principle, as to religion, upon which this system of education was founded; the condition upon which it obtained a Parliamentary Grant, in 1819; the motives which induced Catholics to accept aid under it; the violation of public faith that followed; and the popular indignation which was thus excited against the Kildare-Place Society's Schools. The Royal Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State of Education in Ireland, in 1824-6, saw that the principle and working of this system prevented its becoming one of National Education; and the Government, anxious to found such a system, applied to the Catholic Prelates for a statement of the terms, upon which they would co-operate with it, in the proposed

scheme. The series of Resolutions of the thirty Catholic Bishops, unanimously passed January, 1826, as set forth in my last letter, is the deliberate and solemn reply of those Prelates to the proposition of the Government.

The Resolutions of January, 1826, like those of August, 1859, apply, solely, to the provisions which the Prelates deemed necessary for the protection of the *Faith and Morals* of Catholic children, in the public Schools, and refer to Lecturers and Trainers, who instruct the Catholic Teachers, to the Teachers, who give *Religious Instruction* to the Catholic pupils, and to the Books used in imparting this instruction. Over these the Bishops demanded a veto, but only in so far as the parties undertook the office of Religious Instructor to Catholics, or might influence their Faith or morals; the authority claimed over the Books, to be used for this purpose, rests on the same footing, and that over Secular Books is qualified by the right to object to them "*on religious grounds*" only. The Bishops demanded that, in every public school, in which Catholic children attended, there should be either a Catholic Teacher, or a Catholic Assistant, according as the Catholic pupils formed a majority or a minority of the attendance; and that every such Teacher or Assistant should be appointed by, or with the express approval of, the Bishop of the Diocese. The Bishops, in 1826, *permitted*, without approving of, "the attendance, in the same school, of Catholic with Protestant children, under," as they stated, "*existing circumstances*, provided sufficient care was taken to *protect* the religion of Catholic children, and to furnish them with *adequate means* of Religious Instruction;" to attain which, they insisted on the conditions, as to Teachers and Books, already set forth. The Resolutions of the Bishops, in August, 1859, set out with a statement of the same two principles, "That schools for Catholic youth should insure for them the benefit of a *safe secular* education, and *adequate religious* instruction, in the Faith and practices of the Catholic Church," but which, from the experience derived from the working of both the Kildare Place and National systems, the Bishops now state "can be adequately embodied and acted upon, in this country, only on a system of Education exclusively for Catholics."

These, Sir, form the sum and substance of the Resolutions of the Bishops, in 1859, as in 1826; and the clear demand which they advance is restricted to control over the Teachers who are to give Religious Instruction to Catholic children, and over the Books which contain religious matter, or matter pertaining to religion. When the Bishops briefly refer to the opening terms of the Divine Commission—"Go, *teach all Nations*"—upon which they rest their right to exercise this control, they are hailed by a storm of abuse and misrepresentation from the non-Catholic Press, and accused of advancing the right to control *secular* as well as *religious* education, although both the entire of the passage to which they refer, and the explicit terms of their demands, in the Resolutions, alike refute such an imputation. "Going, therefore, teach ye all Nations," is thus fully qualified in the next text, "teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world;" but the Bishops, in 1859, are



fully as well understood, in their succinct reference, as were their unemancipated predecessors, in 1826, when they closed their Resolutions with the solemn and more explicit assertion of the same right—"appointed, as we have been, by Divine Providence, to watch over and preserve the deposit of Catholic Faith in Ireland; and responsible, as we are, to God for the souls of our Flocks, etc." This right "to teach," was conferred upon and exercised by the Apostles, to whom the Bishops succeed, before the Scriptures, now quoted in its support, were written; and, being recognized as a fundamental principle of the Catholic Church, you cannot ignore it, Sir, however you may dissent from its soundness, in considering any scheme of education for Catholics. Fortunately, the place and time of your own education, and the increasing recognition of this great principle of Episcopal authority in Oxford, enable you to comprehend its importance, in dealing with the Resolutions, the demands enunciated in which are founded upon this right, as their basis. I trust, Sir, I have now fully pointed out that the Resolutions of the Catholic Bishops in 1826, and those in 1829, are identical in principle: that they are precisely similar in the extent of the subject of education—namely, Faith and Morals—to which they apply; that both refer to control over Teachers, Books, and arrangements, only, in so far as they may bear upon, or influence Religion; and that both are substantially the same, in all their main features. Mixed Education, in Common Schools, aided by State Grants, had been in operation but six years, when the Resolutions of 1826 were drawn up, whereas the Resolutions of 1859 are founded on its working for *forty* years (1819 to 1859), under both the Kildare-street Plan, and the present National System. The Bishops, in 1826, agreed to *tolerate*, upon the conditions enumerated, the attendance of Catholic children in Schools where there might be a Protestant Teacher, or a Protestant Assistant; but the larger experience of the working of the Mixed System compels the Prelates of 1859 to condemn it, and demand, as the only adequate security for Catholics, the British or Denominational System. In thus unanimously condemning the National System, the Catholic Hierarchy set forth, under their Fifth Resolution, nine specific heads of objection upon which they arrived at this adverse decision. Having thus availed myself of the Resolutions of 1826, in order to vindicate the recent Resolutions of the Catholic Prelates against the unfounded and offensive attacks of the non-Catholic press, I beg, Sir, to call your especial attention to the complete recognition of this "Pastoral" control over Religious Instruction, hence, necessarily, over those who impart it, and over the books and matter of the instruction, by the Imperial Parliament, and by Government. In 1828, the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Education in Ireland made a Report to the House upon the Reports and Evidence of the Commissioners of Education Inquiry in Ireland, in 1824-6, and, amongst other Resolutions which the House of Commons founded and passed thereon, were the following:—

"That the whole of the separate Religious Instruction in the schools should be placed under the *exclusive* superintendence of the *Clergy* of the respective communions, and that they propose leaving to the Clergy of each persuasion *the duty and the privilege* of giving religious instruction to those who are committed to their care."

These Resolutions of the House of Commons, first printed, in May, 1828, were again ordered, pursuant to the suggestion of the Committee on the State of the Irish Poor, to be re-printed in 1830, and, in October, 1831, your predecessor, Lord Stanley, embodied both Resolutions in his famous Letter, which contains the fundamental principles of the National System, thus—

“One or two days in the week to be set apart for giving, separately, such Religious Instruction to the children as may be approved of by the Clergy of their respective persuasions.”

“They will also permit and encourage the Clergy to give Religious Instruction to the children of their respective persuasions, etc.”

This principle, of Pastoral or Clerical control over Religious Instruction, so clearly set forth in the Resolutions of the House of Commons in 1828, re-affirmed in 1830, and adopted in Lord Stanley's Letter of October, 1831, was thus approvingly referred to by the late illustrious Bishop Doyle, in his Circular, dated 26th of December, 1831, expounding the new system to his Clergy :—

“The Commissioners provide for the Religious Instruction of children, by their respective Pastors, or persons appointed for that purpose by them, as often as those Pastors can deem it necessary.”

Clearly, then, Sir, the House of Commons and Lord Stanley's Government fully recognize the Pastoral control over the Religious Education of the children of their respective flocks, a control upon which the Catholic Hierarchy first accepted the System, which they now assert, on their own behalf, and one jot beyond which they have, in nowise, exceeded, in the Resolutions at present under your consideration.

The Resolutions of the Catholic Bishops, in 1826, in reply to the proposition of the Government, that they should state the terms upon which they would co-operate with them, in a system of National Education, contain an implied condemnation of the Kildare-Place Society's Schools, and, thenceforward, the Catholics rapidly withdrew from connection with that body. Catholic Emancipation, though all-absorbing, was unable to wholly divert public attention from the state of the education of the Catholic Poor, and in 1826-7-8, the Catholic Association, the Catholic Clergy, and the Catholic Wardens, continued to labour to withdraw all Catholics from connection with that system. Upon the dissolution of the Association in 1829, the balance of Catholic rent on hands was voted for education, and the triumph of Emancipation stimulated the people to make any sacrifices for Catholic principle. In the Report of the Kildare-Place Society, for the year ending 5th January, 1831, the number of Schools then in connection, is set down as 1,620, of which 1,021 were in Ulster, and only 599 in the other three provinces, not one of the 1,620 Schools being under Catholic management. Again, of 209 Teachers, trained in the same year, only 30, or one-seventh, were Catholics; and of these not one was in a school under a Catholic Manager, so that the Catholic element had completely eliminated itself from the Society. You cannot, Sir, fail to see, that the Central Training Institution of the National Board, their showy Model Schools, and the 100 District and other Model Schools, in the provinces, are all at the mercy of the same power,

the same popular will, that emptied the Training Schools of Kildare-Place, and struck from its Rolls every Catholic School in Ireland. Let your Government, Sir, but unwisely deny to the Catholic Hierarchy the just and reasonable demand which they now put forward, and, within one week, the voice of Professors Sullivan and Butler may be that of one crying in the wilderness, so far as their Catholic audience is concerned. The order of the Catholic Patrons that their Teachers should return home from the Training Department, their refusal to permit any others to attend, and the expression of their determination to employ no Catholic Teacher who, after a given date, should enter any of the Model Schools, Central or District, would finally settle the question. In thus withdrawing the Catholic Teachers, and the Catholic Pupils from the Central and the District Model Schools, the Catholic people would, in no way, peril the main portion of the aid given to their schools. This move, which would at once paralyse the action of all the institutions under the direct control of the National Board, might be followed up by the withdrawal of Catholic children, which should at once be done, from every ordinary school under a non-Catholic teacher, thus virtually closing hundreds of Protestant National Schools, and either open Catholic ones, or throng those already in operation. These simple remedies would render the schools practically Denominational, and if, by that time, the Government would not be brought to a clear appreciation of its position, the expulsion of non-Catholic Inspectors, from the Schools, and the general adoption of the use of the Sign of the Cross, of mental prayer, hourly, or otherwise, or the introduction of a Crucifix, or of a Statue or Picture of the Blessed Virgin, into each Catholic School, would enable the Government to determine between Denominational and the refusal of all Grants to Catholic Schools. You must now see, Sir, that while conforming to such rules as would entitle them to salary, books, and inspection for their Schools, the Catholic people may, any day, render the Schools completely Denominational, and should this fail to bring the Government to recognize their demand, they have other agencies to which I shall hereafter refer, to compel acquiescence.

The abolition of the Kildare Place Scheme, and the introduction of the National System, occurred at one of the most important political eras of modern times. The establishment of the Kingdom of Greece ; Belgium only a year old, as a free state ; the banishment of the Bourbons, and the installation of Louis Philippe in France, and the agitation for Reform in England, mark the period. In Ireland, the recent emancipation of Catholics ; the agitation of a Repeal of the Union, then first generally discussed ; the anti-tithe warfare, including the butcheries of Newtownbarry and Carrickshock ; and the question of the Protestant Church Temporalities, were all fiercely agitated. Great masses, religious and political, collected and upheaved their slumbering strength, and manifested their might throughout Europe. It was in the midst of this political crisis that your predecessor, Lord Stanley, introduced the system of National Education. Lord John Russell proposed the Reform Bill, March 1831, on the defeat of which, in April, Parliament was dissolved.



At the election which ensued, one of the chief tests put to the candidates in Ireland was unmitigated hostility to Kildare Place and all the systems of proselytising, and this and the Reform tests were the great popular cries at the hustings. In June the new Parliament assembled, and in July and September the Irish Reform and anti-proselytising vote told, effectively, in the overwhelming majorities which carried the second and third readings of the Reform Bill, in the Commons. It was then, and just before Parliament was prorogued, in October, that Lord Stanley announced the National System—the Reform Bill not passed, the democracy of England ready to march on London, and the constitutional problem of the day—"What are we to do with the House of Lords?"

The Marquess of Anglesey returned, in December, 1830, as Lord Lieutenant, after an absence of somewhat over two years, and, in 1831, Lord Cloncurry and the Right Honourable A. R. Blake dined with him, at the Castle, when the education question was fully discussed. His Excellency, late at night, and tired of the subject, fell asleep, and, then and there, the outline of Lord Stanley's Letter was arranged, between Lord Cloncurry and Mr. Blake. At length, I have reached my immediate subject, to discuss which will be the object of my next letter.—I have the honour to remain, Sir, your very obedient servant,

JAMES W. KAVANAGH.

30th September, 1859.

---

### LETTER III.

SIR—The historical and political sketches, given in my former letters, were absolutely necessary, in order to enable you to fully comprehend the circumstances, under which the National System was introduced, in 1831. Not a Catholic school then remained on the Roll of the Kildare Place Society; one of O'Connell's ablest speeches, delivered immediately after the assembling of the New Parliament, June 1831, was a masterly exposure of the anti-Catholic working of that system; the Duke of Leinster, Lord Cloncurry, and all the influential liberal Protestants demanded its overthrow; and, at the General Election in May, "*Borough-mongers*," "*Bible-mongers*," and "*Tithe Proctors*," equally shared in the popular denunciations. In hot haste, at the close of the Session, Lord Stanley announced in the House, on the 9th of September, 1831, the intention of Government to devise a new scheme of Education; but it was only after Parliament had been prorogued, that the Letter to his Grace the Duke of Leinster, dated 31st October, 1831, appeared. This famous Letter was hastily drawn up, and, although few public documents have been the subject of so much discussion, its true character is little understood, because too generally examined, as separated from, instead of in connection with, the time and the circumstances which elicited it. Never having taken any public part, whatever, in political discussions, nor identified my humble name with either of the political sections, who alternately govern

my country, I cannot be suspected of allowing political bias to influence my judgment, in discussing, at this distance of time, the merits of Lord Stanley's Letter. That important State Paper owes little, beyond its compilation, to the distinguished Statesman, whose name it bears. The essential, and few fundamental principles, and provisions of the Scheme were copied from the Resolutions of the House of Commons, in 1828 which formed the real basis of the new system.

In 1812, the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of Education in Ireland recommended the introduction of—

“A system of Education, *from which should be banished even the suspicion of proselytism*, and which, admitting children of ALL religious persuasions, *should not interfere with the peculiar tenets of any.*”

These two important principles were reiterated, directly or indirectly, in the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners of 1824-6, embodied in the Resolutions of the House of Commons, in 1828, and reaffirmed, in 1830; yet most persons refer to Lord Stanley's Letter, the credit of originating what had been publicly announced, nearly twenty years before the compilation of that memorable document. The simple facts are, that a Pro-Reform, but not Reformed House of Commons, in the short Session of 1831 (June 14th to October 8th), was so indignant at public faith having been broken with the Catholics, by the Kildare Place Society, that they voted a Grant for an undefined sort of liberal and fair system, the Government pledging itself to adhere to the Resolutions of the House, in 1828, in framing the new measure. Lord Stanley's Letter, therefore, is the creation of an urgent political crisis, was got up precipitately, and contains no evidence of matured views, founded on a consideration of the great question of Education, from any other points than those which were political and temporary. Numbers of even well informed persons still believe, that the National System was introduced through an Act of Parliament, the result of protracted debate and of matured concession. They have yet to learn, however, that the House of Commons voted a Grant, *in anticipation of a system then but in its inception*; that, during the short prorogation of Parliament, your predecessor, only a few months in office, framed the Letter, embodying the new measure, and that, when the House resumed its sittings, after a few weeks' suspension, it found the scheme promulgated, the Commissioners appointed, the BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION in charge of the infant System, and inducted into their new office, in Dublin Castle.

Before I proceed to examine the leading features of the System, thus introduced, permit me, Sir, to call your attention to the unfounded misrepresentations which the anti-Catholic Press have been freely circulating, in reference to the present, as compared with the original, and the past opinions of the Catholic Prelates of Ireland, upon this System of Education. The Hierarchy are charged with *inconsistency*, but the imputation rests on three unwarranted assumptions—(1) That the Catholic Bishops were parties to the framing of the System, or, at least, that they approved of it; (2) that the System is the same, in its essential features, now, as when founded; and, (3) that it is only of late their opinions of

the System have undergone serious change. I shall summarily dispose of the first and most important of these assumptions. The Government, from January, 1826, up to the introduction of the new System, never consulted the Catholic Hierarchy, upon the subject of Education, nor were they consulted as to the Catholic Members to be appointed upon the National Board. The Catholic body could not approve of nominating, as one of the two Catholic Members of the Commission, Mr. Blake, who had declared, before Parliament, in 1825, that he was in favour of Protestant ascendancy, and who, a few months before his appointment, had signed the Declaration against the restoration of Legislative Independence to Ireland. Then, as at present, Catholic placemen, and crowds of Catholic expectants—chiefly lawyers—thronged the Castle, each professing to be the special and accredited agent of the Catholic Body—Clerical and Lay—and ready to assent, on their behalf, to any terms which the Government might propose. The Catholic Hierarchy were consulted, neither as to the details of the new System, nor as to the Commissioners appointed, by the Marquess of Anglesey, to administer it; and, although they accepted it, as an experiment, they never sanctioned it, save by the tolerance extended to it, owing, as stated by the venerated Archbishop of Cashel, Most Rev. Dr. Leahy, to “*the absence of a better, the fear of a worse System.*”

Lord Stanley's Letter—to the analysis of which I, now, Sir, invite your attention—opens with the important statement that “Parliament,” before it had known the details of the new scheme, “so far sanctioned the arrangement [to constitute a Board of National Education] *as to appropriate a sum of money, in the present year, as an experiment of the probable success of the proposed System.*” That large and influential portion of the public, whose chief source of information is the anti-Catholic Press, and some of the unprincipled Catholic place-hunters and place-men, have been deluding themselves and others into the assertion, that an attack upon the National System by the Catholic Hierarchy, is an attack not alone upon an Act of Parliament, but upon the very Constitution itself. No Statute sustains that system, which was hastily sketched, within the compass of a single letter, which was put in operation in the course of a few weeks' Parliamentary Recess, and the existence of which has, for twenty-eight years, been contingent upon the annual vote of a single item in the civil estimates. Not alone did its framer introduce and avow it “AS AN EXPERIMENT,” but, after he had secured the services of seven of the most eligible Commissioners to conduct the trial, they unanimously agreed that, upon the conditions stated, the problem was impossible. Some portions of the original Letter were struck out, thus, “to supply the schools, at prime cost, with works of *separate religious* instruction;” others, although retained, were rescinded, as the registration of the attendance of the pupils at Divine Worship on Sundays; several were never enforced; and even important additions were made to the Letter, but not with the hope of their becoming operative.

The original Letter of Lord Stanley contained the following provisions:—



(1) The first of the objects assigned by the Government, in founding the new System, was "*to banish the suspicion of proselytism*; and, while admitting children of *all* religious persuasions, *not to interfere with the peculiar tenets of any.*"

(2) Rigid separation of *Religious* from *Literary* Instruction, each to wholly exclude any portion of the other.

(3) Pastoral control over Religious Instruction.

(4) Permission and encouragement to the Clergy, or to those approved by them, to give Religious Instruction, in the school-room, to the children of their own flock, on one or two days in the week, wholly set apart for that purpose, and also before or after Literary Instruction, on the other days of the week.

(5) The appointment of their own Teachers, by the local parties, subject to examination, as to fitness.

(6) The selection of their own Books, subject to the condition that their matter is unobjectionable, for common instruction.

These, so far as it concerns the moral and religious bearings of the System, constitute an epitome of Lord Stanley's Measure; and, on comparing them with the demands set forth in the Resolutions of the Catholic Prelates, in 1826, you will find, Sir, that, under the principles and provisions now set forth, these demands were substantially yielded. The Resolutions allow, under existing circumstances, "*the admission of Catholics into the same Schools with Protestants, provided sufficient care be taken to protect the Religion of the Catholic children, and to furnish them with adequate means of Religious Instruction.*" As to protection, even the *suspicion* of proselytism was to be banished; combined literary, but separate religious instruction—separate as to time, place, matter, and the persons to impart it—and the Rule and the practice of *excluding* the Catholic, or any child, from being present at any other religious instruction than that which its parents directed it to attend, all combined to afford, when enforced, the fullest protection *possible*, under a Mixed System. As to means of Religious Instruction, the Catholic Clergy were secured opportunity, both of time and place, to instruct the Catholic children, or to appoint others to instruct them, in every School attended by Catholics. The two leading demands of the Prelates were, therefore, complied with in the new System. It is true that the control over Teachers, and over secular Books, claimed, in the Resolution of 1826, was not conceded; but, as the new System held out aid to the Clergy, for their existing Schools, and encouraged the establishment of others, it was their own fault if they did not multiply them, so as to secure all the Catholic children in their own Schools, where the Clergy could have entire control over both Teachers and Books. Harassed with eleven years' experience of the proselytizing working of the Kildare-place Society, and trusting in the good faith with which the new measure was tendered, the Catholic Hierarchy gratefully accepted the National System, but, with a diffidence natural to those who had before their eyes the sad history of the previous three centuries.

It will not only be instructive, but fair, and necessary, that we should, now, Sir, consider the effect which the announcement of the new System

had upon the members of the Established Church and upon the Presbyterians. The entire body of the Protestant Clergy, and all but a small fraction of the Protestant laity, at once, gave the most powerful opposition to the System. They stated, and most truly, that,

"It was in *avowed concession* to the principles of the Church of Rome, with respect to the Word of God, that the National System was introduced." (Evidence of the Rev. W. L. Trench, D.D., Hon. Sec. to the Ch. Ed. Soc., House of Lords, 1854.)

"That Letter (Lord Stanley's) put forward, as a fatal objection to former Plans, that they had not been in accordance with the principles of the Church of Rome; and, evidently, intended to substitute a Plan in which the Priests were to determine whether children should read the Scriptures, or not." (Archdeacon Stopford's Letter to the Protestant Clergy of Meath, 1847—p. 56).

Many opposed the System, because it prevented the *forcing* of the Protestant Bible upon Catholics; others because it restricted its use, even by Protestants, to certain fixed days and hours; all resisted the recognition of the Catholic principle of Pastoral authority, in matters of Religion; numbers objected to the right secured to the Catholic Clergy of access to the Catholic children, in all schools, for the purpose of giving them Religious Instruction; but the feature of the new System that evoked most general hostility was the original Rule which required non-Catholic Patrons and Teachers to *exclude* Catholic children, from non-Catholic Religious Instruction, in the schools. This opposition to the National System, and the grounds upon which it rested, had the natural effect of attaching the Catholics to it, and it is the tradition of this attachment and popularity which yet lingers among some of the early Catholic supporters of the System. I shall prove, just now, that delusion could not be more complete than the belief that the System, as at present administered, contains any one of the fundamental principles, for the protection of religious conscience, in Lord Stanley's Letter.

The opposition of the Presbyterians was far more violent than that of the Protestants of the Established Church. In 1832-3, the Synod of Ulster condemned the System, and, in the latter year, they submitted certain Propositions to Earl Grey, then Prime Minister, demanding modifications in it. In 1834, Monster Meetings were held, sometimes attended by as many as 5,000 persons, numbers of whom were armed; they assembled, at sound of trumpet; were headed by Clergymen, who opened the proceedings with prayer; each person, in the procession, flourished his Bible over his head; tall poles were carried, bearing boards with the words "HOLY BIBLE SCHOOL," to be set up instead of the inscription "NATIONAL SCHOOL," which was taken down, whenever met, and publicly burned; and the proceedings closed with thanksgiving, for the emancipation of the Bible, from the thralldom of the new System. Schoolmasters were expelled from National Schools, by armed parties; gun-clubs were generally established, for the protection of the Word of God; and so apprehensive of serious violence were the clerical leaders of the movement, that they enjoined abstinence from strong drinks, on those who attended the monster-meetings. To the stimulants of trumpet-peal, psalmody, gun-clubs, and military array, ejection of schoolmasters, burning of boards, and wrecking, were added the spirit-stirring lyrics of the Clerical Laureate of the movement, who, in Iambics, such as these, denounced the abominable System:

“ And why should then a Gorgon Board  
 Supplant the Bible in the Schools,  
 And o’er the shrine of conscience lord  
 A System framed by Pontiff’s tools ? ”

This intense opposition, on the part of the Presbyterian body, generally, continued, with slight modification, until the hostility to the new System, from all sections of Protestants, had attained such magnitude, that an Inquiry into its working was ordered, in 1836, in the House of Lords, and in 1837, in the House of Commons. In January, 1840, the Presbyterian body, formally and finally, joined the National Board ; since 1847, very many clergymen of the Established Church have also been reconciled to the System ; and it is of the utmost importance that you, Sir, should thoroughly understand the phenomenon, how the Catholics and the Presbyterians have exchanged places with each other, reversed their original attitudes, in relation to the System.

The general character of Lord Stanley’s Letter, and the serious departure from the System laid down in it, are nowhere more clearly, or more ably stated, than in some of the educational Pamphlets by Archdeacon Stopford, the careful perusal of which I commend to you, Sir, in your examination of this great Question.

“ It was the great misfortune of the Irish System,” says Archdeacon Stopford, “ that it was introduced and established *upon political motives*, before the principles which should govern a National System of Education, under our present Constitution, had been sufficiently discussed. Had Lord Stanley’s Letter been more philosophical and less political—had it enunciated principles, and eschewed entering into cases, it would have been more politic in the end.

“ The Board have, ever since, laboured under the difficulty entailed on them by this beginning. Public opinion and experience have led them, ‘ *from the very first, to a gradual, though unavowed and incomplete, correction of the original errors ; for which they have not yet obtained due credit.*’ ”

In reference to Pastoral right, as set forth in Lord Stanley’s Letter, Archdeacon Stopford says :—

“ I have formerly shown (Report to the Bishop of Meath, pp. 11, 12, 13)—that the Board have set this aside ; that they rejected, from their Rules, *all reference to Priestly authority*, and recognized the parent’s only. Lord Stanley’s Letter still continues (1847) to be printed and circulated by the Board, and, while it is so circulated, will tend to keep up such impression ; but I think that those who consider the matter carefully, ought to give the Board *credit, for the changes which they have actually made*, and should not hold them responsible for Lord Stanley’s Letter, *when they have actually departed from it.*” (Archdeacon Stopford’s Letter to the Protestant Clergy of Meath, 1847.)

This general description of Lord Stanley’s Letter is quoted from the writings of one who, up to 1847, had been a powerful antagonist of the National System, but who, while an advocate for a *separate* grant, has, ever since, been in connection with the Board, and, even on recent occasions, came forward as a champion of the System. In 1844, he entered, at the instance of his father, then Bishop of Meath, upon an examination of the Rules of the Board, with a view to effect the connection of the Protestant Schools, in Meath, with the Commissioners, the result of which he thus states :—

“ To the *original system* of the Board, however, as laid down in Lord Stanley’s Letter, and carried out in the *original Rules*, the objections of the Clergy remained unabated ; few or none were willing to co-operate in the Plan then proposed”.



The chief objection made by the Protestant Clergy of Meath, that strongly advanced by the Presbyterian body and by the Church Education Society, was against the original practice of the Board, of which Archdeacon Stopford states :—

“The Commissioners had affirmed that it was *of the essence of these Rules* that the Patron *should exclude* from Religious Instruction all who were not *actually directed by their Parents to remain.*”

In May, 1845, nine of the fourteen Irish Protestant Prelates, headed by the Lord Primate, 1,700 clergymen, 83 Peers, and 1,631 influential Landlords of the highest rank, signed an address to Sir Robert Peel, demanding certain changes in the National System, and the Petitions of 60,000 persons supported the Appeal. This grievance, on the Protestant conscience, to exclude Catholic children from Protestant Religious Instruction, as required by the Rules of the Board, is thus clearly stated in the Address :—

“That parent has no right to *require others* to be his instruments in enforcing an *unlawful* exercise of his authority over his child.”

“They could not recognize such an exertion of parental authority, as if it were *lawful*; and, even if it were *voluntarily* exerted, in forbidding the Bible to be read, our Clergy could not consent to bind themselves *in giving effect* to such an unlawful command. But when they regard the parent as *himself* in bondage to the usurped authority of the Church of Rome, and as not exercising his own free will, but obeying, as a passive agent, in binding the *same yoke* upon his children, *the duty of refusing to co-operate with him is still clearer.* The Clergy may be able to do but little towards delivering their Roman Catholic countrymen from such bondage, but they can, at least, *keep themselves free from the guilt of becoming instruments in rivetting its chains upon them,* and this accordingly, they resolved to do.”

The Prime Minister, in an able letter to the Lord Primate, dated 9th June, 1845, reiterated this Rule of the Board, but refused to rescind it, or to comply with any of the demands in the Address.

In the years 1844-5-6-7, Archdeacon Stopford continued to press this objection of the Protestant Clergy ; towards the close of 1847, the Commissioners yielded ; rescinded this Rule, without which the fundamental principle of “*banishing* from the Schools even the *suspicion* of proselytism” could not be maintained ; and, thus, the National Board gave the death-blow to what remained of Lord Stanley’s original System. On effecting his great object, Archdeacon Stopford, at once, published an address to the Protestant Clergy of Meath, from which I make the following important extracts :—

“In thus counselling you to connect your Schools with a System *which has attained its present form through a course of silent change within*, and assailed by vague generalities from without, it may be well to point out the actual position in which you would stand by accepting aid, on the terms *now* at your acceptance.”

“The National System has been, from the first, progressively approximating to the System now adopted in England. That every change, almost without exception, has been in the right direction, I have always declared. My only desire was to see those changes avowed and carried out so far, that we could avail ourselves of them, without compromising principles which we believed to be true. That the Board are *now* disposed to co-operate with us, I believe.”

“Your joining the Board, *at once*, is rather the way to promote a further approximation to the English System.”

“Were the Regulations of the Board revised, in some of their details, to give that relief to the minority, which the changes of the System in other respects have rendered just and reasonable, I am by no means sure that it would not be better for us than the English system.”

The essential Catholic principle of Church authority, in all matters of Religion, as explicitly laid down in Lord Stanley's Letter, was early set aside, but without conciliating Protestant support. The Rule, as set forth in successive Codes, from 1831 to 1847, as sworn to by Commissioners, before Parliamentary Committees; the Rule, to be signed by applicants, as a primary condition, upon which, alone, they could obtain aid; the Rule, as rehearsed in Leases and Trust-Deeds; the Rule, which was resisted by the Presbyterians, denounced by the Prelates, Clergy, and Gentry of the Established Church, and the subject of their appeal to the Prime Minister, in 1845—this Rule, which, for sixteen years, had afforded some religious protection to Catholic pupils, in Schools under non-Catholic Patrons—now containing 100,000 Catholic children—was rescinded by the National Board, and proselytism, on the largest scale, thus authorised. For proofs of the proselytising, under this new Rule, of, what is called *non-compulsion* (substituted for *exclusion*) of pupils, I beg, Sir, to refer you to the *sworn* testimony of Rev. Dr. Henry, one of the Commissioners; Mr. M'Creedy, Chief of Inspection; Professor Sullivan, one of the Heads of the Training Department; Dean Kennedy and Archdeacon Stopford, Managers of National Schools; Rev. Messrs. Irwin and Campbell; and A. G. Stapleton, Esq., all of whom were examined before the House of Lords, in 1854. Further, I would call your attention to similar testimony, in the publications of Rev. Mr. Henderson, in 1855, and in those of Rev. Mr. Fraser, and Dr. Ferguson, Q.C., in 1859. Lastly, I refer you to three Parliamentary Returns, one (1855), in reference to the Lancasterian National Schools, Belfast; another (1858), to the Ballindine National Schools, County Mayo, moved for by Mr. Maguire, M.P.; and a third (April, 1859), the suppressed portion of a General Report by Mr. Keenan, Head Inspector, upon 200 National Schools visited by him, in 1855, in Ulster, moved for by the Right Hon. W. Monsell, M.P.—all three Returns, supplied by the Commissioners of National Education, from the Official Reports of their officers. This evidence, and these publications and Parliamentary Returns, will satisfy you, that no scheme of Popular Education which has been in operation in Ireland—neither that of the Kildare-place, nor of the Church Education Society, approaches the National System, in facilities for, and in effectual proselytising of Catholic children.

I, now, pray your attention, Sir, while I rapidly point out the changes in the System made for the Ulster Presbyterians, and how far these changes affected Catholic interests. They objected to the right of Catholic pupils, in Presbyterian Schools, to have *one* day in the week *set apart* for their Religious Instruction, respecting which Rule, Dr. Kelly, Secretary to the National Board, stated to the House of Commons, in 1837—

“I know it [this right] has been objected to, by members of the Synod of Ulster; that they have nicknamed those days set apart, as *fifty-two Popish Holidays*.”

Rev. Dr. Cooke, who, last week, in the General Assembly, in Belfast, most warmly denounced the Pastoral of the Catholic Prelates, and vowed undying attachment to the *present* National System, sent one of his emissaries, as Professor Sullivan reported, before the House of Commons in 1837, round the village of Lagan, near Belfast, with a letter, challenging any one to defend the new System against *seven* charges, therein enumerated, one of which was—

"The Romish Priest is a visitor of the School, whether the Committee will or not, and can turn out the Protestant children *one day*, every week in the year, to teach that Protestants are *heretics*, and cannot, as such, be saved, being out of the pale of the Church."

That Rule, in force from the first, in all schools, was embodied in the Leases of those which were erected by aid from the Board, up to 1838, when it was modified to "one day in each week, or *part of a day*," but, in 1840, the Presbyterians insisted upon the right to wholly exclude from the schoolroom, all Religious Instruction not approved of by them, and which was conceded. This serious change in Rules, which had been in force from 1831, at once, deprived tens of thousands of Catholic children of the right to produce a Catholic Catechism, or have any person, priest or layman, to visit, to give them Catholic religious instruction, in any non-vested school, under a non-Catholic patron, and thus rendered these schools forbidden, as failing to fulfil one of the two main conditions laid down in the Resolutions of the Catholic Bishops in 1826, and, at the same time, rescinded so much of Lord Stanley's letter as secured the fulfilment of that condition. The change of Rule of 1847, which rescinded the obligation of Protestant patrons to *exclude* Catholic children from non-Catholic instruction, opened the way to general proselytism, and lured the Catholics into Protestant instruction, whilst the previous change of 1840, deprived them of all right to receive their own Religious Instruction in the schools. Thus was completed the subversion of Lord Stanley's System, and the rejection of the two essential conditions upon which the attendance of Catholics, at such schools, was permitted by the Resolutions of the Catholic Prelates. The concession to the Presbyterians, in 1840, brought over many clergymen of the Established Church to support the system; Rev. F. F. Trench, an active supporter of the Board, thus states:—

"The *only* Regulation of the National Board which *ever* was an obstacle to my placing a school in connection with it was, that which allowed the Roman Catholic Priest to come into the school, to teach error; *that*, I never could have allowed; but when that point was ceded to the Presbyterians (in 1840), the sole objection which I ever had to being under the Board was removed."

The Presbyterians objected to the Rule of the Board which prohibited school-houses from being used as Preaching Stations, Meeting Houses, and places of Public Worship; and another of Rev. Dr. Cooke's *seven* objections to the National System was, that—

"No Minister dare ever *preach* in the schoolhouse, or all assistance would be forfeited."

In 1837, this Rule was first relaxed, and gradually rescinded, until, under the new Code of 1855, every Presbyterian National School may be used for all conceivable religious purposes, save only the administration of a Sacrament, but as this forms no essential element in their worship, the Presbyterian Schools are, *bona fide*, Meeting-houses, used for prayer-meetings, lectures, psalmody, and as theatres for the new spiritual exhibitions called Religious Revivals. I would request your special attention, Sir, to the sworn evidence of the Rev. Mr. Campbell, to that of Mr. Cross, and to that of Rev. Drs. Henry and Cooke, in 1854, upon this subject.

The phenomenon which I undertook to explain—namely, the reversed position of Catholics and non-Catholics, in relation to the National System, must, long since, have been simplified to you. Not one fundamental



principle of Lord Stanley's Letter remains; the whole System was gradually subverted. I have entirely understated the case, and, in my present letter, confined my attention to a few broad features of the great Question. You have, however, learned enough of the National System to look with pity upon the political quacks and educational charlatans, who advise you to try and modify it, or restore it to its original purity. To tolerate it is simply impossible; to restore it is equally so. The first blow which must be struck by the Catholic Bishops, and it lies a contemptible corpse, to which the wealth of British Debt cannot give one spasmodic movement. As the Charter Schools fell, as the Kildare-Place Society fell, so will the present System fall. The Presbyterians have rendered it all that they desired, and, naturally, they stand forward in its defence. Archdeacon Stopford and numbers of those who assisted in subverting the original System, now warn Protestants against the British System. At length, the eyes of a certain class of Catholics are opened to the reality that, instead of desiring their fair share of the public funds for their own Schools, Protestants, of all denominations, would forego the claim, to retain a system more favourable to proselytism than any that had preceded, than any that can ever succeed it, in Ireland.

The Presbyterian General Assembly declared, last week, that their National Schools are far more soundly Scriptural and controversial, than those of the Church Education Society; and I grieve, Sir, to be obliged to endorse the declaration, in so far as the Catholic pupils in both are concerned. Presbyterians want no British System, which would deprive them of 20,000 Catholic pupils, now being proselytised, in their National Schools, and restore them to Catholic Schools, which would spring up beside the Presbyterian ones. Mr. Keenan reports that in every one of the Presbyterian Schools which he had visited in Ulster, in 1855, the Teacher gave Common Religious Instruction to all his pupils, Catholics, Protestants, and Presbyterians, none of them retiring.

Anxious to complete my exposition of the origin, and the principles of Lord Stanley's System, and the subversion of it by the Commissioners, for Protestants and Presbyterians, I have extended this letter beyond its expected length.

Have I not, Sir, fully, clearly, and incontrovertibly established the strict accuracy of the Fifth Resolution of the Synod—

"That the changes made, from time to time, in the Rules of the National System, having been adverse to Catholic interests, have increased the distrust of the Catholic Episcopacy"?

Have I not, Sir, similarly proved the strict accuracy of the ninth, and last objection to the System enumerated by the Prelates, under this same Fifth Resolution—

"That, in Schools deriving aid from the Board, Catholic children have received, and may receive, Religious Instruction from Protestant Teachers, in opposition to the original constitution, as laid down by Lord Stanley"?

The secondary evils of the System, and the impossibility of remedy, other than its total abolition, will form the subject of my next Letter.—I have the honour to remain, Sir, your very obedient servant,

JAMES W. KAVANAGH.

4th October, 1859.

## LETTER IV.

SIR—My last letter dispels the illusion that the *present* scheme of Education, known as the *National System*, is that introduced by Lord Stanley; in 1831. Lord Stanley's was an *anti*-proselytising, the present is a *pro*-proselytising scheme. Lord Stanley's Measure provided *time* and *place*, in the schoolroom, for the *separate* religious instruction of every Catholic child, by its own Pastor, or by a person authorised by him; the present system denies this right, to tens of thousands of Catholic pupils, in schools under Presbyterians and Protestants. From 1831 to 1840, Presbyterians refused to accept aid under Lord Stanley's System, because of their objection to the Rules which thus provided for the Religious Instruction of Catholic pupils, who might attend their schools, and, in order to obtain the support of the Presbyterians, these Rules were abolished, January 1840. Presbyterians, and Protestants of the Established Church, opposed Lord Stanley's System, from 1831 to 1847, because it obliged every non-Catholic Patron, or Teacher, to *exclude* Catholic children from Religious Instruction, unless their Parents had formally and expressly *directed* them to attend thereat. The honest observance of this Rule afforded Catholic children full protection against proselytising, during *separate* Religious Instruction; but, in November, 1847, after the Rule had been *sixteen* years in operation, it was abolished, at the instance of Protestants. There are 100,000 Catholic pupils in 1,311 National Schools managed by Presbyterian and Protestant Patrons, and their position, under the present System, is as follows:—

1. With the exception of a small fraction that attend in Vested Schools, whose erection was aided by the State, every one of these 100,000 Catholic children is, under the concession of 1840, deprived of all right to receive Catholic instruction, in the Schools, or even to produce a Catholic Catechism within their walls.

2. In these 1,311 Schools, the general practice is to have a *Bible-class*, before or after literary instruction, when the 100,000 Catholic pupils *may*, and tens of thousands of them *do join* in reading the Protestant Bible, which is explained to them by a staff of 1,800 Protestant and Presbyterian Teachers and Assistants. Protestant and Presbyterian Catechisms, in many Schools, Controversial Lectures, and Psalmody, in others, and Circulating Libraries, in some, make up the full course of Religious Instruction, to which all Catholic children are invited, and of which numbers of them partake, under the concession of 1847.

Adverting, again, Sir, to the Resolutions of the Catholic Bishops, in 1826, and to the System of Lord Stanley, in 1831, it is quite clear that Catholic pupils, placed in the position now described, have neither the sufficient *protection* against *Proselytism*, nor the *adequate means of Religious Instruction*, primarily demanded by the Prelates; and that the *present* System, under which they are reduced to that position, is in complete antagonism to the fundamental principle of Lord Stanley's Scheme—namely, “combined literary, but *separate* religious instruction,” “even the *suspicion* of *Proselytism* to be *banished*,” and “such religious education to be given to the children, as may be approved of by the *Clergy* of their respective persuasions.”

Next to the abolition of Pastoral Control, or Church Authority, in matters of Religion, to abrogation of the right of Catholics to receive Religious Instruction in Schools, under Protestant Patrons, and to exposure to actual Proselytising, the evil of gravest moment in the present, as compared with the original System, is what is called the *common*, as distinguished from the *separate*, or denominational religious element. In my last Letter, I pointed out, as the second of six leading provisions of Lord Stanley's System, the "Rigid separation of *Religious* from *Literary* Instruction, each to wholly exclude any portion of the other." Rev. Mr. Carlisle, a Presbyterian Clergyman, a Commissioner, from 1831 to 1838, suggested to the new Board, at its first meeting, 1st December, 1831, that they should ask permission of Lord Stanley, not to require them to *exclude* from the several Books, which they had got permission to edit, "such portions of religious or moral teaching, as may be approved by the Board." After much discussion, this proposition was assented to, but with little expectation of its practical success, and with the important proviso that the *entire* Board should be *unanimous* in approving of any such matters as might be introduced. Lord Stanley granted the permission, which was interpolated in the original draft of his Letter; but the amended addition was not published for many years afterwards. Rev. Mr. Carlisle, in a letter to *The Times*, so late as 1854, thus describes this important change in the original system:—

"This concession considerably altered the original proposed System, and rendered it, instead of being a rigid system of *exclusion of all religion*, from the deliberations of the Board, and the common education of the people, an *experiment* how far Roman Catholics and Protestants could proceed together, with perfect unanimity, in introducing *Scriptural light* among the population, generally—an experiment, considering what the state of Ireland has been, for centuries, perhaps the most interesting and important, but, at the same time, *the most delicate and difficult* that ever was entrusted to any Commission."

The Commissioners, although they had obtained permission to *edit*, and *print* approved Books, not to compose or compile new ones, soon, unwisely, entered upon the preparation of an entire series of works, amongst which were some of an exclusively religious character. Translations were made, *de novo*, of four Books of Scripture—Genesis and Exodus, from the Old, and the Gospel of St. Luke and the Acts of the Apostles from the New Testament. Three of these four volumes were prepared by Rev. Dr. Carlisle, the fourth by Rev. Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, and all were corrected by His Grace Archbishop Whately, a Commissioner from 1831 to 1853, but no alteration, whatever, was made, in the draft of the works, by either of the two Catholic Commissioners.

The Board earnestly, and unanimously recommend these Extracts from Scripture to the careful attention of Teachers and children, "not only as *truth*, but as truth recorded under the influence of *inspiration*," "to be used in *all* schools receiving aid from them." Rev. Mr. Carlisle, in his evidence before the House of Commons, stated, that—

"Unless a Schoolmaster were limited in his power of exposition, *it would be easy for him* to give his instruction a *peculiar religious character*, even taking the Extracts *solely as its basis*."

"The Schoolmasters are themselves exercised upon them. The Extracts are *explained* to them, carefully, while they are under *Training*, and they are sent out *prepared to explain them to the children*."



It is to be observed, Sir, that Rev. Mr. Carlisle, besides being Resident Commissioner, was also Professor of Education in the Training Department, and that the duty of explaining, to Catholic Teachers, "*truth* recorded under the influence of *inspiration*" was monopolised by him, in company with the Head Master of the Model School, Dr. MacArthur—nephew to Mr. Carlisle—another Scotch Presbyterian—and Mr. Rintoul, a third Scotch Calvinist, both which gentlemen had been Ushers in an Academy, in Dublin, kept by Rev. Mr. Carlisle, before his appointment as Commissioner. In addition to this *new Bible*, thus projected for the Catholics of Ireland,—brought out by Anglican and Scotch Divines, and the use of which was taught, after the manner indicated—a small Manual of Devotional Hymns, or sacred Poetry, was prepared, by Rev. Mr. Carlisle, from the works of Rev. Dr. Watts, and other *pious* Protestant writers. This *Vade Mecum* consists of *prayers*, for various times and occasions, hymns, paraphrases of Scripture, psalms, and moral and religious maxims, and Mr. Cross, the Board's Secretary, describes it as, "containing many sacred truths and precepts, which are to be found among the inspired writers." So anxious were the Commissioners for the distribution of these five volumes of common Scripture and common Devotion, for "introducing," as Rev. Mr. Carlisle states, "Scripture *light* among the population, generally," that, in less than two years, they issued, gratuitously, 130,000 copies of these works, throughout the National Schools.

For some time, these works were used, in a considerable number of Schools, as when they were taught by Catholic Teachers, no serious danger was apprehended, but His Grace Most Rev. Dr. MacHale, very soon, roused public attention to the imminent peril involved in the whole scheme of the new common religious element in *Mixed* Schools. I would commend, Sir, for your deep consideration, the Letters of the illustrious Archbishop of Tuam, upon the subject of National Education, especially those written during the years 1838-9, addressed to your present colleague, Lord John Russell.

"Seldom," writes the Archbishop, "has a more injurious expedient, than the Scripture Lessons, been adopted, to withhold from view the opposition, on point of doctrine, between different Christians. But, mark, my Lord, at the end of every lesson there is a series of questions, to be put by the Master, and answered by the Scholars, embodying its entire substance. There is not a point of controverted doctrine, between Catholics and Protestants, that may not thus be made the subject of insidious interrogatory, by Masters, who were, themselves, trained in the manner of teaching those Lessons, by Presbyterian Teachers, who, I suppose, were as anxious to '*get rid*' of the reverence paid to the Blessed Virgin, as Rev. Mr. Carlisle was of *Penance*, or Luther of the *Real Presence*. Nestorians, in religion, as far as regards their jealousy of the honour of the Mother of God, they have, designedly, expunged the '*Hail, Mary, full of Grace*,' lest children should find, in those Lessons, those words which they are taught to lisp, from infancy, with affectionate veneration. It is not wise, my Lord, it is not statesmanlike, to strive to dissolve the holy charm that consecrates those truths that are imbibed in childhood. The same Church that instils into the tender minds of children a reverence for the Mother of God and revered of Heaven, as sedulously labours to impress upon them a respect for the Throne."

In 1838, his Grace Archbishop Whately submitted to the Board his "*Introductory Lessons on the Truth of Christianity*," which the Commission-

ers approved, and published, as a *Sequel* to their Fourth Book of Reading Lessons. Writing of this work, in 1839, to Lord John Russell, the venerated Pontiff of the West says:—

“Next comes another precious production, having for its title, ‘*Lessons on the Truth of Christianity*.’ Whole parcels of those poisonous Tracts have been sent ‘*On Her Majesty’s Service*,’ for the use of the National Schools. What a precious cargo, to be dispensed to the Catholic children of Ireland! The author’s name is not appended, but, if report says true, they have come from the pen of one who has been designating the Ministers of the Catholic Church as, ‘*adepts in Priestcraft*,’ and their religion, a ‘*mystery of iniquity*;’ their sacraments, ‘*superstitious charms*,’ and their public worship, ‘*a kind of magic incantation*;’ their practices of piety, ‘*a train of superstitious observances worthy of Paganism*,’ and, in fine, the Catholic Church itself, ‘*the — of Babylon*’ (Whately’s Errors of Romanism). Were our pious ancestors to be proffered a Book, on the subject of Religion, written by a man capable of reviling their Church, and Faith, and Priesthood, in such profligate terms, they would indignantly consign it to the flames. In the present enlightened days, such persons must be the compilers of the Theological Primer, from which children are to lisp the first rudiments of Christianity. What a guardian of the integrity of the Faith of the Catholic children of Ireland! This is, truly, the guardianship of the Kite, which, in its impatience to seize and devour the entire prey, scares off all rival vultures.”

These advances, in the publication of a series of Books exclusively upon the subject of Religion, and drawn up by Scotch and English Divines, spread intense alarm, and the Court of Rome was appealed to, in this emergency. Agents were sent over, both on the part of the Prelates who supported, as well as on the part of those hostile to the National System, and, in January, 1841, these works, *Scripture Lessons*, and *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity*, were not only condemned by the Holy See, but the entire principle upon which they were intended to be used was reprobated. The Papal Rescript, dated 16th January, 1841, admonished the Irish Hierarchy,

“That it is much safer that *Literary Instruction only*, should be given in *Mixed* Schools, than that the *fundamental* articles, as they are called, and the articles in which *all* Christians agree, should be taught there, in *common*, reserving, for *separate* instruction, the tenets peculiar to each sect; for this manner of acting, in regard to children, appears *very dangerous*.”

This admonition was embodied in the Decree of the Council of Thurles (Art. III., National Schools) in 1850, confirmed by the Holy See, in 1851, and re-affirmed in the Synod of Dublin, 1853. To meet this opposition of the Catholic Prelates, the Rules, as to the use of the Scripture Lessons, Lessons on the Truth of Christianity, and Sacred Poetry, were modified in 1840, and again in 1853, when the Commissioners struck off their List, as unfit for common use, Archbishop Whately’s *Christianity*, after it had been fifteen years in the Schools. This retrograde step caused the retirement of Archbishop Whately, Judge Blackburne, and Baron Greene from the Commission, and also caused the Inquiry in the House of Lords, in 1854, into the working of the System.

The Scripture Lessons and Sacred Poetry are in use in almost every one of the Model Schools, Central and District, scattered over Ireland, and, where read by Catholic children, are taught to them by Protestant, as well as Catholic Teachers; they are also read in a considerable number of Ordinary Schools under non-Catholic Patrons. The Synod of the Province of Dublin, in their Pastoral Address to the Catholic Clergy and Laity, dated July, 1853, enjoins:—

"The Scripture Lessons appear to have been compiled for the purpose of giving *a united Religious Instruction to Catholic and non-Catholic children, in the same class*; WE REPROBATE SUCH A PROJECT. *Separate Religious Instruction*, as it was laid down by the Statesman who first introduced the National System into Ireland, *is the only protection for Catholics*. It is contrary to the spirit and practice of our Holy Church, to sanction *united Religious Instruction*, or to sanction any instruction, on matter connected with Religion, given to Catholics by persons who themselves *reject* the teaching of the Catholic Church. The injunction we now give you is to remove the works, just mentioned, from the hands of your children."

The importance attached by Protestants to the use of these works by Catholics, under Protestant Teachers, may be understood from the following testimony. The Rev. F. F. Trench, long a supporter and Patron of National Schools, says (*Observations on National Education*):—

"Where we fail in inducing Roman Catholics to read the *whole Bible*, can it be doubted but that the Scripture Extracts may do some good? The Extracts teach the doctrines of grace."

He then proceeds to refer to sixteen portions of seven Books of the New Testament, quoted in the Extracts, which, he alleges, are calculated to establish certain anti-Catholic doctrines, and he thus concludes:—

"I suspect that the generality of persons do not know that these *precious passages of Scripture* are in the Scripture Extracts, and may be explained in the School."

He then goes on to describe the religious zeal of the Rev. Mr. Carlisle, author of the Extracts, and, in astonishment, says:—

"Why the Board entrusted this most important work to such a man, many would think it hard to say; but so it was, and I believe the hand of God to have been in it, for good to the Church."

Rev. Mr. Carlisle, in his evidence, in 1837, before the House of Commons, states that he could not conscientiously put his own School under Kildare-Place Society, because it prevented Teachers from *explaining* the Scriptures to the pupils, "but," says he, "our Extracts, embodying, as I formerly explained, *illustrations of Scripture by Scripture*, is a mode of explanation which would not have been tolerated, I conceive, by the Kildare-Place System."

Rev. Dean Kennedy states:—

"The Roman Catholics, in my National School, receive *combined Religious Instruction*, in the Scripture Lessons, and are examined with the Protestants, who read the same portions of the Authorised Version, and I may mention that an opponent of the Board, and a friend of the Church Education Society, at the half-yearly examination of the children of my School, examined the classes, and, himself, awarded prizes, for the best Scripture answering, to Roman Catholic children. In my Schools, there are Roman Catholics receiving a greater amount of Scriptural education, through the medium of the *secular* Books of the National Board and the Scripture Lessons, than in any Church Education School that I know. This is my deliberate conviction." And, on his oath, the Dean adds, "*I think the principles of the National Board are the principles of the Reformation.*"

The sworn evidence of Rev. Dean Moore, of Cashel, Rev. Dean Warburton, of Elphin, both Patrons of several National Schools, as well as the testimony of many other Protestant Clergymen, is almost equally strong as to the advantages which may be taken of the use of the Scripture Lessons.

I would, now, Sir, invite your attention to the ordinary Reading Books of the National Board, their authors, and the matter of those publications. From a Return (No. 148) to an Order of the House of Commons,



dated 22nd March last, it appears that the titles of 69 volumes are set forth, as forming the entire Catalogue of the works on the Price List of the National Board. These consist of two classes, those written expressly for the Board, the copyright in which they have purchased, and those of authors who supply copies of their works at a moderate rate, which arrangement may close at any moment. Of the 35 volumes written for the Board, 20 are of a Religious, Moral, Literary, or Historical character, every one of which contains matter liable to disputation, in Mixed Schools, five of the 20 being Scripture Extracts and Sacred Poetry. The other 15 volumes consist of 13 Reading Class Books, and two on Geography and History. These 20 volumes were written, or compiled by Most Rev. Archbishop Whately, and members of his Grace's family, Rev. Dr. Arnold, Rev. J. Carlisle, Dr. M'Arthur, Messrs. Cross, Rintoul, Reid, Mason, and Spalding, and Mr. M'Dermott assisted in the compilation of one volume. With the exception of the last named gentleman, who is an Irish Catholic, the writers are all Scotch Presbyterians and English Protestants. Again, of the 34 works sanctioned, but not published by the Board, there are 10 of an educational, historical, or literary character, all of them containing matter open to controversy, five written by Archbishop Whately, Rev. Dean Dawes, and Messrs. Young and Hullah—all Englishmen—the other five by Professor Sullivan, and all the ten works composed by Protestants. Nearly all the thirty volumes upon Religion, Education, History, Logic, Political Economy, and English Literature, which form the Popular Cyclopædia of millions, not alone as their school manuals in youth, but, as the sole Library of a hundred thousand humble homesteads, were composed by Scotch and Englishmen, anti-Catholic in faith, anti-Irish in feeling. Rev. Mr. Carlisle, a Calvinist, provides the Scripture; Rev. Dr. Watts, a Dissenter, the Devotional Hymns; Hullah, an Anglican, the School-songs; Cross, the English Poetry; Sullivan, the Prose; Rev. Dean Dawes and Young, both English, the principles of Education; Carlisle and Sullivan, the History; Archbishop Whately, the Logic and Political Economy; and his Grace, assisted by his English family, and Rev. Mr. Carlisle, assisted by a tribe of Caledonian Ushers, provide the series of ordinary Reading, or Class-Books for the millions of Irish Catholics. To exclude the possibility of question, in reference to the precise character of these Class-Books, I shall submit it, in the Commissioners' own words, from "*Analysis of the School-Books*, published by authority of the Commissioners of National Education."

"One of the main objects, in compiling and publishing this series, was to supply, not merely the National Schools, but the public generally, with works moral and religious in their character, without being sectarian. Lessons on the subject of Religion, drawn chiefly from the narratives of the Holy Scriptures, are interspersed through all the Reading Books, and constitute an interesting epitome of Sacred History. These are commenced in the First Book, and carried on through the remaining volumes. The lessons in the First Book are of a moral kind, and conclude with one decidedly religious; several in the Second Book communicate important religious truths, and are well fitted to create devout feelings. The religious sentiments inculcated in the Sequel to the Second Book are of the purest and most elevated kind; and the next work following, affords a striking example of the successful manner in which some of the most important truths of Revelation are blended with secular instruction

in the Irish National School Books. The admirable abridgment of parts of the Old Testament, in the Third Book, is not intended as a substitute for the Bible, but to prepare the pupils for a more extended course of religious instruction, and a more beneficial study of the inspired volume. Apart from the Scriptural Lessons continued in the Fourth Book, it contains several poetical pieces of a devotional character, of convenient length to be committed to memory, and calculated to strengthen the moral feelings. The Supplement to the Fourth Book contains a summary of the Old Testament, including a detailed account of the Prophets, and the substance of their prophecies; besides several essays on religious subjects by Archbishop Whately and other eminent Divines. The excellent lessons in the Girls' Reading Book form a complete manual of moral and domestic duties, whether in single or married life; and the Selections from the British Poets are pervaded by a spirit of genuine piety, and are well adapted for family reading."

The Commissioners, in a Parliamentary Return, inform us who the authors of these works are, and they also, in the statement now quoted, make known to us the object and general character of their productions. The explanatory mode of teaching, aptly expressed in the School-maxim, "Question the subject into the Pupils, and then question it out of them," affords to teachers the amplest facilities for using the Scriptural and Historical Matter, which permeates all the Lesson Books, for the purpose of inculcating Religious opinions, and, thus, the incidental texts of Scripture which occur in the lessons on minerals, plants, and animals, apart altogether from those on Scripture and Scripture History, may be used for the purpose of sapping the faith of Catholic children. There are 100,000 Catholic children in National Schools, under Protestant and Presbyterian Patrons, taught by 1,799 non-Catholic Teachers, and all these children are exposed to danger, from the abuse of the religious element which pervades their Books. The following important evidence places this matter in a clear light. Rev. J. Campbell, Incumbent of Trinity Church, Belfast, visited 55 National Schools, in 1854, chiefly in the town of Belfast, and, from his evidence before the House of Lords in that year, we extract the following:—

"The Presbyterian Mistress of Murphy-street National School informed me that none of the children *refuse* to receive the instruction which she gives, which consists of *reading the Bible*. If explanation of the Bible were given, she said there would be refusals; but during the *Lessons* from the *ordinary Books* of the Board, opportunities do occur, which can be, and are taken advantage of to *instil* religious instruction, *without suspicion*; she added, '*Who is to take notice of this?*'"

Again, in the Whiteabbey National School, the Presbyterian Mistress informed him that,

"She imparts Religious Instruction *whenever she pleases*, on any occasion that may suggest itself during the day. There is no one to forbid it. She has been in the School for some years, and she may do it, as, to use her own words, '*This is a Presbyterian School.*' She does not consider the introduction of Religious Instruction into her ordinary teaching, a breach of the Rules, as there is no one to restrain her."

There were Catholic children in both these Schools, and Rev. Mr. Campbell, from observation of all the National Schools visited by him, in Belfast, adds,

"The ordinary Books contain Religious Instruction of a certain character, and, to a certain amount, sufficient to give a Teacher an opportunity of branching off from it, and giving peculiar Religious Instruction, if so disposed."

Rev. Dr. MacIvor, Ex-F.T.C.D., Rector of Ardstraw, Diocese of Derry, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, in Trinity College, an active supporter of the present system, thus writes:—

"The Commissioners, in having produced these Books, have conferred a benefit on the country and on the world, not easily calculated. I speak not of their literary excellence, high as this is admitted to be, but of their *religiousness*, the *earnest piety* pervading them, and *ever* expressing itself in *positive instruction*, so full and definite as to enlarge one's idea even of Catholicity itself. No one can use these Books, I believe, without being drawn nearer to his neighbour and to God."

Sir James Graham, in the Debate in the House of Commons, June 1850, reviewing the Books of the National Board, stated,  
 "Although the National System had not borne all the fruits at first promised from it, yet its success had been signal. He believed there was no Roman Catholic country in Europe, in which, with the consent of the Catholic clergy, an education so Scriptural had ever been tolerated as that given in the National Schools; and he warned the House, that if this *light* be extinguished, there was little hope of the social improvement of Ireland."

No one, however, has, at all, approached Rev. F. F. Trench in clear, lucid exposition of the Protestant gain and the Catholic loss, by the use of the common religious element in the Class-Books of the National Board. Exhorting the Protestant Clergy to place their Schools under the Board, he says:—

"It strikes me very forcibly, that when we teach the points of doctrine we are agreed upon, we teach *true religion*. We teach what is generally understood by *Protestantism*, when we teach the doctrines upon which Protestants and Romanists are agreed. I admit that, strictly speaking, we cannot be said to teach Protestantism, because, strictly speaking, Protestantism is protesting against error. But, in another sense, we do teach Protestantism; for the Protestant religion—the religion of the Reformation—is the simple truth of the Gospel, stripped of the errors superinduced by the Church of Rome. For instance, in the National School Books, probably many hundred times, Christ is spoken of as '*Our Saviour*.' The belief of that truth, in its naked simplicity, constitutes a Protestant. The Roman Catholic does not believe in Christ as his Saviour, in the same full and simple way in which a Protestant believes in Him as such. To constitute a young Romanist, the child must be taught that something else besides Christ is our Saviour. So, I say, that in the compact to have those points taught in Schools, upon which Protestants and Romanists agree, the Protestant has, decidedly, the *advantage*, and the Patron can teach Protestantism, *i.e.*, the doctrines of grace, to every child in the School. I am of opinion that the Patron might even 'pledge himself under hand and seal, that he will *let Romanism alone*,' during certain hours of the day, so far as refraining from controversial teaching can be considered as, necessarily, letting Romanism alone. But, in my judgment, if a Christian minister educates Roman Catholic children on the points upon which Protestants and Roman Catholics are *agreed*, which he may do at all hours, *he is very far from letting Popery alone*."

You have now before you, Sir, the declared opinions of the Catholic Church, as uttered by individual Prelates, as affirmed in Provincial Synods, as promulgated by National Councils, and solemnly confirmed by the Supreme Pontiff, upon the grave subject of "*united Religious Instruction*, and instruction on matters connected with Religion." On the other hand, you have before you the Works published by the National Board, with the Commissioners' account of the religious and devotional contents of those works; the names, creed, and country of the authors; sworn testimony as to the use made of those Books, by non-Catholic Teachers; and the exalted mission that Protestant Clergymen and Protestant Statesmen see for these works, in Protestantising the Catholic youth of Ireland. If the Catholic child should escape the meshes of the proselytising net, woven for him in 1847, and not join in the morning Daily Bible-class, the afternoon Catechism class, the Evening Lecture, the Prayer-Meeting, or the



Religious Revivals of the Presbyterian or Protestant School ; if he should further escape the traps of the Scripture Extracts and the Sacred Poetry ; from another patent-snare, however, he has but a solitary means of escape, namely, *flight*. To enter a National School, under a Protestant Teacher, is, necessarily, to read the *Class-Books*, to have their Scriptural matter, devotional sentiments, and pious maxims thoroughly questioned into the Catholic child, and then questioned out of him, and, while doing so, the Teacher is very "*far from letting Popery alone*." As a simple illustration of the truth of the Rev. Mr. Trench's views, permit me to mention one of the thousand similar incidents inseparable from this absurd attempt to give common instruction to Protestants and Catholics, in any matter above, beyond, or outside of our *common human nature*. You are probably, at this moment, Sir, in the suite of His Excellency, in the Infants' Model School, Marlboro'-street, pointing out to the ex-Royal Family of France the striking resemblance between Irish and French children, in vivacity, intellectual quickness, and in many other respects. The two Teachers of these 400 infants are Protestants and English, although upwards of 320 of the children are Catholics. The Head Master, giving a gallery lesson on Rewards and Punishments, and using the elliptic method, proceeds thus:—

"Now, my little dears, have you ever seen a large, black, close carriage, like a big box ; with feathers from the top of it, and cars and carriages after it ; with many people along with it, and all looking sad ?" "Oh ! yes, Mr. Young—a *Hearse*." Artistically, then, the Master brings up before them the ideas of Death, the Soul, good and evil, rewards and punishments, and proceeds, "Well, my little darlings, when we die, if we had been good when here, our souls will go to——?" "*God*," "*Heaven*," etc., answer the crowd of little theologians. "But if we had not been good, our souls will go to ——?" "*Hell*," "*The place below*," "*To the bad angels*," etc.—"Quite right, my little pets." A prattling six-years-off here cries out, "Mr. Young, mightn't our souls go to the other place, *Purgatory* ?" another, "Sure, Mr. Young, there is no where like that?" The hubbub becomes general, but the Master's manner settled the question, the little Purgatorian was told, "Fold your arms," and the Lesson proceeded.

A gentleman, who was present at this occurrence, struck with the incident, went to the Education Office, and reported it. The matter was brought before the Board, and the Master was censured, but upon what ground the Commissioners did not state ; clearly, the fault was in the *System*, which attempted such instruction, and not in the Teacher, who had unwittingly *exposed* its pernicious results. Rev. Mr. Trench's maxim is fully illustrated in this actual occurrence—such daily teaching, of only so much as Protestants and Catholics believe, *in common*, is "*very far from letting Popery alone*."

I have, now, Sir, discussed the graver departures from Lord Stanley's System, those upon which Catholic conscience can enter into no compromise with any Minister, nor with any political party. In my next Letter I shall point out many and serious grievances imposed upon Catholics, by the present System, some of which abuses, however, being open to

remedy, would be out of place here. I have not gone into a detailed exposure of the anti-Catholic character of some of the Board's publications, for the simple reason that the Prelates of my Church having condemned these works, together with the principle upon which most of the Books are drawn up, supersedes, for me, the necessity of such a task. The Catholic Hierarchy

- (1) Condemns the Common Religious Element, which pervades the Ordinary Reading and Class Books;
- (2) Reprobrates the Common Religious Element, as in the Scripture Lessons, etc.;
- (3) And execrates the practice of Catholic Children attending in Bible and Catechism Classes, under non-Catholic Teachers.

Apart from these very grave abuses, the denial of suitable opportunity, and the absence of all means for Religious Instruction, in almost all the National Schools under Protestant Patrons, are sufficient to unfit such Schools for the attendance of Catholic pupils.

None of these abuses could be remedied otherwise than by total abolition of the present System, although they have, every one of them, arisen, as I have fully proved, from subversion of the original Scheme, as laid down by Lord Stanley. If Lord Stanley's System were now proposed, no party would accept it. All the modifications and subversion to which it has been subjected have, in 28 years, brought to its support but 70 Clerical and 243 Lay Members of the Established Church. Against it the Presbyterians waged incessant war, for ten years, and any attempt to deprive them of the privileges which they have obtained would eventuate in a return to their former hostility. You may not, Sir, be aware that, in the years 1830-1, the Catholic Clergy and Laity petitioned for Separate Grants, which, had all the Prelates firmly stood out, would have been obtained, at that time, instead of Lord Stanley's System. The Catholic people have had forty years' experience of both the Kildare Place and of the National System, and it is beyond the power of any Government to continue a *Mixed* Scheme of Education in Ireland. The Presbyterians have, by the recent Resolutions of their General Assembly, declared in favour of the present System. The Protestant Primate has also declared in favour of *united* education, but, Anglicans and Calvinists, alike mean the education of Catholics, in their Schools, by Protestant and Presbyterian Teachers. The letter of the Protestant Primate entirely misrepresents the demands of the Catholic Prelates. His Grace alleges that the Pastoral of the Catholic Hierarchy demands:

- (1) "Separate grants of money from the State, for the purpose of maintaining Schools under the exclusive control of the Prelates of the two Churches."

The Catholic Prelates, in their Pastoral, ask for no such thing. They ask for grants for Catholic schools, but they do not ask for *Separate* Grants, in the sense alleged, that is, that Parliament would set aside a certain portion of the Funds voted for Education, giving one gross sum to Catholics, and another to Protestants. They ask for Denominational

and Separate *Schools*, as in England and Scotland, and for aid to these Schools, out of the *common State Grant*. The Prelates do not claim control, exclusive or partial, over the Funds, no more than the Catholic Bishops in England do over the funds administered by the Privy Council.

(2) "We have no wish," says his Grace, "to see the secular instruction in Schools exempted from the superintendence of a Board of Commissioners appointed by the Government."

The Pastoral of the Catholic Prelates affords no grounds whatever, for supposing that they make any such demand. It condemns the Constitution of the Board, the System, its administration, and the control which is assumed over matters vitally affecting *religion*, but it does not demand exemption of *secular* instruction from Government superintendence.

(3) "We think it right," says his Grace, "that the secular instruction, given in Schools which are aided by the State, should be tested by Inspectors appointed by the State."

The Catholic Prelates demand exemption of secular instruction in Catholic Schools from being tested not by State Inspectors, but by *Protestant* Inspectors. The Catholics in Great Britain, and in the Colonies, cordially submit their Schools to State Inspection, but the officers so appointed must be *Catholics*.

(4) "We also," says his Grace, "deem it but fair and reasonable that the Patrons of the several Schools should have the right of nominating the Teachers, and that the power of appointing them should not be vested in the Bishops and Clergy."

The Pastoral of the Catholic Bishops demands and contemplates exclusively Catholic Schools, under Catholic Patrons and Catholic Teachers, and, because the latter are intended to act as *Religious Instructors* to the pupils, the Bishops claim control to that extent, but neither the sole nor the exclusive control over their appointment and removal. The right of Patrons to nominate their own Teachers is neither invaded, nor questioned, in the Pastoral of the Catholic Prelates.

(5) "To commit," says his Grace, "to the hands of the Hierarchy of the Established Church, and the Hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church, an uncontrolled power over two separate grants for supporting schools for separate education, is, certainly, not the mode of dealing with this vexed question, which I, for my part, would counsel or advise."

No such uncontrolled power is claimed by the Pastoral, and the sense in which a *separate* grant is demanded has been already explained. So far back as 1850, the Catholic Hierarchy, in the First Article of the Decree of the Council of Thurles upon the National Schools, thus clearly demanded the substitution of the British, or Denominational, instead of the National or Mixed System:—

"We have seen, with satisfaction, the British Government latterly give, in England, aid towards the education of Catholic children *separately*, and according to the standard of Catholic Religion. A right thus admitted, we claim to participate in for ourselves. For, if it be just and expedient that the Catholics of Britain be aided out of the Public Treasury, in the Separate Education of their youth, there is no reason why the faithful Catholics of Ireland should not be treated in the same manner."

His Grace the Protestant Lord Primate, therefore, entirely misrepres-



sents, although unwittingly, I have no doubt, the demands which are embodied in the recent Pastoral of the Catholic Hierarchy.

The Resolutions of the Presbyterian General Assembly, recently passed in Belfast, similarly misrepresent the claims of the Catholic Bishops. One of the Resolutions "deprecates the proposal made by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of a separate grant, under their own *irresponsible control*," but in so doing, it deprecates a proposal never made.

Another of the Resolutions of the Presbyterian General Assembly states that "Their Church has uniformly and invariably acted upon the principle of *non-compulsion*, since it was first planted in this country." This statement is not borne out by evidence; on the contrary, the means for its disproof are ample. W. D. Ferguson, LL.D., Q.C., in his Pamphlet, "National Education in Ireland—1858," states, after having, as Assistant-Commissioner under the Endowed Schools' Commission, inspected many of the Presbyterian Schools, in Fermanagh, Donegal, Londonderry, and Antrim;

"In the times of the Kildare-Place Society, the Presbyterians, certainly, had a considerable number of Schools in its connection. They had also many Schools in connection with the London Hibernian Society; and the *universal* and *compulsory* reading of the Bible was the *rule* in both Societies. In 1832, the Synod of Ulster again declared that the Bible, unabridged, should be the basis of National Education; and, prior to 1835, the Presbyterian Body, in Ireland, does not appear to have made any declaration in favour of this principle of *non-compulsion*."

Rev. Dr. Henry, President of the Queen's College, Belfast, a Commissioner of National Education, when under examination, before the Lords' Committee, in 1854, was examined by Right Rev. Dr. O'Brien, Protestant Bishop of Ossory, in reference to the contradiction between old Presbyterian practice and recent Presbyterian profession, when that Prelate thus summarised Rev. Dr. Henry's sworn evidence:—

"You have deprived yourself, by your connection with those Societies, in which the *Compulsory System* was carried out, of the power of saying that *the Compulsory rule is contrary to Presbyterian principles*."

A sect whose apostle, Calvin, had Servetus burned, at a slow fire of green faggots, on a charge of "Heresy and Blasphemy," although he merely professed to have studied the Scriptures, in the true Protestant spirit, and found, therefrom, that *our Saviour is not God*; a sect whose apostle inculcates the duty of the civil magistrate to punish for false doctrines; a sect that entraps thousands of Catholic children into their National Schools, inveigles them into attendance at religious instruction, contrary to that which their parents profess, and then boasts that *non-compulsion*, or proselytising without physical violence, is their principle;—larceny, and not highway robbery; coaxing the last loaf from the poor man's child, by the decoy of other willing children, and then pleading non-compulsion,—this is the morality of the Ulster Calvinists. The declaration in their Resolution is false, and the History of their sect, from Geneva to Belfast, contradicts it.

Whatever may be your own opinion, Sir, or that of the present Ministry, as to the extent to which the demands of the Catholic Prelates should be yielded or resisted, time will reveal to you that no previous agitation ever entered upon, in this country, has moved the Catholic con-

science, stirred up recollections which were better forgotten, or arrayed the Irish millions in such deadly hostility to the Protestant Church Establishment, as would a refusal—which I cannot suppose—to concede Free Education to the Catholics of Ireland. The Catholic and Liberal Irish vote may determine the tenure of office of any Ministry, that rejects the claims of Catholics, and, should any Catholic, or Liberal Member act contrary to the feelings of the constituency which he professes to represent, popular indignation will, I doubt not, consign him to merited political annihilation. It was not Lord Grey's Ministry, still less was it Lord Stanley, who generously granted the Scheme of 1831; it was the votes of the honest farmers of Ireland, that extorted it from the Government.

In my next Letter, I shall bring under review some of the other leading abuses of the present National System, before entering upon the mode by which the demands of the Catholic Hierarchy may be practically conceded.—I have the honour to remain, Sir, your very obedient servant,

JAMES W. KAVANAGH.

11th October, 1859.

---

## LETTER V.

SIR—In my present Letter, I propose to point out some of the many other evils, in the present system of Education, of which Catholics justly complain. As I am anxious to close, for the present, this correspondence with another Letter, I am obliged rather to *indicate* those abuses than to enter into a minute exposure of each of them, a course the less necessary, as I have, elsewhere, stated, at length, each of those matters of complaint. First of these evils, in point of principle, is the *Training and Instruction* of Catholic Teachers. Like other great Institutions, the Normal or Training School for Teachers is Catholic, and existed in France long before Pestalozzi was born. The Abbé de la Salle, founder of the Christian Brothers, was known to fame before Bell, Lancaster, Stowe, Wilderspin, or any British or Irish Educationist had appeared above the horizon. It would be not only a waste of time, but it would be disrespectful to you, Sir, to dwell upon the importance of the Training of the Teacher. If the maxim, "As the *Teacher*, so will be the *School*," be true; then, clearly, "As the *Trainer*, so will be the *Teacher*, and *thence the School*." The Normal School is, therefore, the head and heart of every system of Education. Whoever holds and directs that power, commands the *mind* of the Nation. The Books are important, but their living interpreter, the Teacher, is far more so. Evil in the Books might be rendered comparatively innocuous; the good in them might be perverted to evil. Under almost every system, the heads of the Normal School are the authors of the Manuals of Method, and of most of the works on Education. Stowe, in Glasgow; Dunning, in the Borough Road Schools; McLeod, in Chelsea; Hughes, in Greenwich; Tate, when in Kneller Hall; and, thus, in St. Mark's, in Westminster, in White-lands, and other Training Colleges, and Normal Schools, the Heads of the Institutions are generally the authors of the Works upon Education,

a result most natural, and most reasonable. They embody, in those Manuals, their own views, the Lectures, which they are accustomed to deliver, and the practices and methods, which they prescribe, that the Teachers may have the Manuals by them, as works of reference. Soon after the National System had been introduced, the new Commission opened Model and Training Schools. The Resident Commissioner, Rev. Mr. Carlisle, went to his Academy, on Ormond-quay, and turned in, therefrom, his nephew, Dr. M'Arthur, and his other usher, Mr. Rintoul, both Scotchmen and Presbyterians, to be heads of the Model School, for the Catholic children of Dublin and the Catholic Teachers of Ireland. Kildare-street Model School, from which the Catholic Clergy had withdrawn all their Teachers, sent in two Heads, for the Female Department. In a little time, an Infants' Department was required, and Mr. Wilderspin, an Englishman and a Protestant, who got charge of its organisation, brought in his daughter and her husband, both English and Protestants, as the sole teachers of 400 infants, over four-fifths of whom are Catholics. Rev. Mr. Carlisle retired, owing to fiscal difficulties, of an official kind; and Dr. M'Arthur, on having become insane, obtained a pension from the Crown; but, out of the 35 works published by the Board, and *now in use* in the Irish National Schools, these two Scotchmen wrote, compiled, or edited 21, that is, three-fifths of them. Of these 21 volumes, 14 are upon Scripture, Sacred Poetry, History, and English Literature. On the withdrawal of these two Scotchmen, who had had chief charge of Didactics, or the art and science of Teaching, Professor Sullivan, an Ulster Protestant, was appointed in their stead. This gentleman, assisted by Mr. Rintoul, a Scotch Calvinist, has, for the last twenty-one years, discharged the duties of the Professorship of Education, filled by the Rev. Mr. Carlisle, and is Professor of History, English Language, and Literature, Logic, Political Economy, and Geography—of every *moral* subject in fact, in the Teachers' Course of Study. The mathematical and physical portions of the course are taught by Catholics. Professor Sullivan, also, succeeds the Scotchmen in the monopoly of authorship. He has written or published three works on Education, and six others on the English Language, Geography, and History. Schoolmistresses, as well as Masters, are included in Professor Sullivan and Mr. Rintoul's classes, Mr. and Mrs. Young, English Protestants, have, for 21 years, had charge of hundreds of Catholic infants, and they, too, have brought out the Manual of their System, for the use of Teachers. Rev. Dean Dawes (of Hereford) has also contributed a work on Education, which is on the Board's List, and strongly recommended for Teachers. This brief statement affords an incomplete idea of the sad position of the normal establishment for Catholic Teachers, who form upwards of *four-fifths* of the whole staff of the Irish National Schools.

Our Catholic Female Teachers are taught all the above-named moral branches by Professor Sullivan, an Ulster Protestant, Mr. Rintoul, a Scotch Calvinist, and Mr. and Mrs. Young, English Protestants. They are taught Drawing, by an English Protestant; Cutting out and plain needle-work, by an English Protestant; Fancy work, by three Ulster Presbyterians; the House-Keeper, who superintends their domestic life,



is a Protestant; the Doctor is an Ulster Unitarian; the Dentist is a Protestant; the very Manual of Cookery and Domestic Thrift was written in England, and by Protestants; the sole Inspector of their Domestic Economy and Life, was, up to a short time past, an Englishman, and a Protestant, and has been succeeded, by two gentlemen, one of whom is an Englishman, and, of course, a Protestant. I feel, Sir, that I incur the risk of exciting your secret contempt, for Irish Catholics, who, for 28 years, have submitted to such a state of things. An Irish Catholic has only to cross over to Liverpool, and then he will see, in vivid contrast, in the Female Training College, under the Nuns of Notre Dame, the relative working of the Irish Mixed, and the British Denominational Systems. Suffering would appear to be the badge of all our tribe, so extend your pity, Sir, to us, but your indignation to the shameless London Press, that grossly abuses the highest and the holiest amongst us, because they demand the British System, and threaten the destruction of the Irish, which has produced results such as I have detailed. Under the Kildare-Place Society "our tyrants were," at least, "our countrymen," and, if such chains as theirs failed to bind, what think you of the strength and durability of those forged by Archbishop Whately, Bishop Higgin, Dean Dawes, Messrs. Cross, Claridge, Wilderspin, and Young—all English—and Rev. Dr. Carlisle, and Messrs. M'Arthur, Rintoul, and others, Scotch Calvinists? You, now, can have no great difficulty, Sir, in understanding why non-Catholics, the Church Education Society, and the Presbyterian General Assembly, should support the *Mixed* System.

In 1826, the Catholic Hierarchy unanimously declared to the Government:

"That we consider it *improper* that Masters and Mistresses, intended for the Religious instruction of Roman Catholic youth, should be trained, or educated by, or under the control of persons professing a different faith."

In 1840, the Prelates, including Most Rev. Dr. Murray, then a Commissioner of National Education, unanimously passed the following Resolution, which they submitted to the Lord-Lieutenant:—

"That the Lecturer in the Model Schools, appointed to instruct the Roman Catholic Teachers of National schools in the principles of *Religion, Morals, or of History* (which is capable of being explained in an irreligious or offensive manner) should be Roman Catholic."

In 1841, the Holy See admonished the Bishops, on the same subject, adding—

"For it is not fitting that a Catholic should be taught the method of giving instruction in Religion or Religious History by one who is not a Catholic."

In 1850, the Council of Thurles re-affirmed this declaration, which again appears in the recent Resolutions of the Catholic Prelates, and forms a portion of the grounds upon which they are charged with inconsistency, with advancing new and aggressive demands, and with repudiating all state control in the matter of education.

Within the last ten years, a new and most serious evil has been brought into action—namely, the extension of local Model Schools, throughout the provinces. In brief, the State has turned Schoolmaster, in Ireland. Under a Despotism, this would be reasonable and intelligible, but under a Representative Government it is an invasion of civil right. Already the State has erected large and numerous Schools, in twenty of the 32 counties of Ireland, and each year brings an extension of those establish-

ments, the Schools in which now number about one hundred. That the State should control the Army, the Navy, and the Police is just, but that it should monopolise the education of the Freeholder, who determines the Government, is unconstitutional, and dangerous to civil liberty. Within the length and breadth of Great Britain, there is not one school, save those connected with the Army and Navy, under the exclusive control of the State. These Model Schools are being built in open defiance of the strongest remonstrances of local feeling, and of the opposition of the Catholic Prelates. Sites have been selected and contracts entered into for the erection of Model Schools in Enniscorthy, Sligo, Derry, and Cork, in open contempt of the Bishops of those Dioceses. These establishments are objectionable in the highest degree. Neither ecclesiastical nor local control of any kind, is recognized in them. The staff, in every instance, consisting of a mixture of creeds, is appointed by the Board. In almost every one of them the reprobated Scripture Lessons are read, and taught by Protestants. About 200 Youths, called Pupil-Teachers, aged from 16 to 18 years, reside in them, as *Boarding* Schools, the resident Teachers and these Youths being, in every instance, *mixed* as to creed. Considering difference of circumstances, the bastardy and other grave immoralities in some of the model schools as Coleraine, Clonmel, Dunmanway, Farrahy, Limerick, and Glasnevin, are worthy of the worst days of the Charter schools. In Galway the Presbyterian minister uses the Visitors' Book to set forth controversial diatribes against Catholics, in Ballymena, three of the Catholic pupil teachers had to resign, to avoid dismissal, for refusal to use some of Professor Sullivan's books, which their spiritual director had inhibited; and in Belfast a brisk trade is attempted by Rev. Mr. Prentice, lately an assistant-master in that very model school, who proposes to buy up the souls of the Catholic boys, at the rate of 5s. a week each.\* In the Central Model, West Dublin, Limerick, Clonmel, Kilkenny, Athy, Trim, Galway, Newry, Belfast, Ballymena, and Coleraine Model Schools, the teachers of thousands of Catholic infants are Protestants and Presbyterians. In brief, in the Model Schools, with their annexed Training Departments, is concentrated every abuse that Catholics have alleged against the Charter Schools, the Kildare Place Schools, the Queen's Colleges, and Trinity College. The Lord Chancellor, in his address on Friday last, when conferring Degrees upon the students of the Queen's University, clearly and distinctly stated, in your own hearing, Sir, that the National Schools and the Queen's Colleges are only different grades of the same scheme, and pointed out how the connection might be drawn still closer by the addition of classics to the course of study in the Model Schools, which would thus make them feeders to the languishing Queen's Colleges. His Lordship is a Commissioner of the National Board, and five other Members of that body were selected as Members of the Senate of the Queen's University.

Inspection forms the subject of another of the Resolutions of the Catholic Prelates. The objection made by the Hierarchy is not to *State*

\* One of the Catholic Female Teachers of the Belfast *Model* School has just renounced her Faith, and has become a Presbyterian. The public Press has given extracts from *Whittaker's Goldsmith's History of England*, prescribed for the use of Catholic pupils in this *Model* School.

Inspectors, as incorrectly represented by the Protestant Lord Primate, and by all the anti-Catholic Press, but to *Protestant* Inspectors over Catholic Schools. Upwards of 21 years ago, in a letter to Lord John Russell, the Archbishop of Tuam, thus denounced this feature in the system :—

“ Had I been hitherto silent on this anti-National Board, the singular appointment of twenty-five District Inspectors, of whom a majority, for Catholic Ireland, are Protestants, should force from me the exposure of all its evils. What has any of your Protestant Inspectors to do with the Catholic children of the province of Connaught, for example, with whom there are scarcely any Protestants to mingle? As your system is avowedly a *mixed* one, for a mixed population, its working cannot be adapted to a country in which no such mixture is found. Does your Lordship seriously imagine that I shall permit that Board, or any such uncanonical body, to send their Protestant missionaries into the Schools of this Diocese, composed, exclusively, of Catholic children, there to be in communication with them, and tainting the simple purity of their Faith with the poison of the Books of Mr. Carlisle?”

The Inspectors now number seventy, and while the number of pupils is *over five* times that of the Protestants, *less than half* of the Inspectors are Catholics. Some of the Inspectors are open and known infidels, some are Apostates, some are Arians, some Methodists, some Presbyterians, some Anglicans, and many are Freemasons. Nine of the Staff were taken from the Queen's Colleges. Almost all these men obtained their places through political and official influence, without even the form of an examination, and numbers of them would fail to pass in the entire of the course prescribed for Second Class Schoolmasters under them. As might be expected—some from want of qualification, others from the corrupt influence of the service—most of them are the mere creatures, and trembling dependants of the Resident Commissioner, and of the Heads of the Staff. The moral tone of the Institution may most easily be exemplified by the following statement. After the publication of my Book, “*The Catholic Case Stated*,” instead of the Board giving an official and prompt contradiction to any allegation in it, if such could be given, the Presbyterian Head of the Inspection Department went off duty for some weeks, and prepared the two Pamphlets which, doubtless, Sir, are in your hands, and copies of one of which have been sent to every Patron of a National School in Ireland. To defray the expenses of these publications, the following circular, soliciting subscriptions, was sent from the Education Office to each of the Inspectors, and to the staff in all the Model Schools. For your information I have added to the names the offices held by the respective parties.

[May be returned to any of the parties named in List.]

THE ANTI-CALUMNY FUND.

Intended to give circulation to the refutation of misrepresentations published against the Board and its officers.

1859. To the following Subscriptions

May.

Sullivan, Dr., Professor	. . . . .	£1 0 0
Cross, M., Secretary,	. . . . .	1 0 0
Kelly, J., do	. . . . .	1 0 0
Claridge, J., Accountant.	. . . . .	1 0 0
M'Creedy, W., Chief of Inspection	. . . . .	1 0 0
Keenan, P. J., do	. . . . .	1 0 0
Fleming, J. G., Head Inspector	. . . . .	1 0 0
Fitzgerald, Michael, Inspector.	. . . . .	0 5 0
Rintoul, J., Asst. Professor	. . . . .	0 10 0



O'Sullivan, Daniel, Assist. Professor . . . . .	0	10	0
Larkin, J., Head Master, Model Schools . . . . .	0	5	0
Young, T. U., Head Master of Infants' School . . . . .	0	5	0
Dunbar, H., Clerk . . . . .	0	5	0
Additional Subscriptions in the Office . . . . .	7	19	0

(Signed) . . . W. M'Creedy.

Men subscribed to this Fund who had never read *The Catholic Case*, and almost all subscribed in utter ignorance of the contents of the publication, the circulation of which they were called upon to promote. Inspectors subscribed to it who, if examined on Oath, would be the best witnesses to prove the truth of every statement in the alleged misrepresentations. Of the 13 names, Messrs. Cross, Claridge, and Young are English, Mr. Rintoul, Scotch; we pay these gentlemen £2,100 a year, to help to civilise us, and, as a just return, they vilify ourselves, our creed, and our country. There are the names of five Catholics to this List, four of whom had held situations under me, at least to two of these I rendered important services towards their advancement, and some of the four have, themselves, repeatedly charged the administration of the System with many of the grave abuses which I expose in my book. The Appeal being headed by the Chiefs of all the Departments, most of the subordinates subscribed, but Mr. Keenan and others omitted to state how deeply indebted to them I stand for the best materials of my Book. The Fund was obtained under false pretences, and misapplied; no refutation of any statement in my Book has as yet, been published, and I doubt not that you, Sir, never expect to see such a publication.

The control and influence of the Inspectors, over the Teachers and the Schools, have, from year to year, been increasing, owing to a variety of causes, and hence the necessity of saving the Schools from lapsing under the direction of Protestant Inspectors.

To the following evils I can barely refer:—

1. Prohibition of all traces of the Symbolism of the Catholic Church upon, within, or about Catholic Schools. The sign of the Cross, pictures, statues, and religious emblems of every kind are banished.
2. The use of the sign of the Cross, even in silence, and mental prayer are forbidden. Three National Schools at Phibsboro, the Cabra Convent School, the Kells Convent School, the Sienna Convent School, the Goresbridge Convent School, and other Schools have been struck off, or suspended, solely on these grounds. These practices had been permitted up to Sept., 1853.
3. Monks' Schools, save the five existing ones, are denied all aid, so that the Christian Brothers' Schools, if they would accept aid, could not obtain it. Up to 1855, Monks' Schools got grants.
4. New restrictions have been imposed, which prevent the spread of Convent National Schools in large Cities, and the grants of Salary both to Monks and Nuns are below the half of those given to ordinary teachers.

I shall not enter upon any of the other numerous grievances which the System imposes, but proceed, in my next Letter, to point out how the British System, demanded by the Catholic Prelates, may be extended to Ireland. Upon one point, Sir, I pray you will take early precaution. The Catholic people have no confidence whatever in Lord this, or Sergeant that, or Master So-and-so, as Catholic Commissioners. They repudiate

any representation of them which these gentlemen may assume. They are not organs or agents of the Catholic body, nor do they possess their confidence. If you really desire to approach the settlement of the Education Question, I beg, most respectfully, to suggest that all Catholic placemen, Catholic placehunters, and, especially, all Catholic lawyers, save Baron Hughes, who knows something of the subject, be excluded from your councils. I hope to have the honour to lay before you, on Wednesday morning, the closing Letter of this Series, and remain, Sir, your very obedient servant,

JAMES W. KAVANAGH.

17th October, 1859.

## LETTER VI.

SIR,—In my previous Letters I have gone into an examination of all but two of the Resolutions contained in the Pastoral of the Catholic Hierarchy, who, this day, re-assemble to consider your Reply, on behalf of the Government, to the demands embodied in those Resolutions. The Resolutions which yet remain to be noticed, are, that in reference to the change made as to school-property, and that which condemns the constitution of the Board. From the introduction of the National System, in Oct. 1831, up to 1845, the Board aided the erection of Schools, the sites, fabrics, and property, in which were vested in local parties, who held it in trust for the public. These parties, three for each school, were appointed by the Parish or district, and, in case of Catholic Schools, generally included one or two clergymen. The Trustees not only held the *title* to the *property*, but they had the election of the Patron or Manager, who appointed or removed the Teachers; determined the Books, prescribed the course of study, fixed the arrangements for Religious Instruction, and, in fine, was invested with the entire moral government of the schools. In 1845, the Commissioners obtained a charter of Incorporation, cancelled the Rule as to Local Trustees; and refused further aid to erect schools under that form of tenure. Since 1845, all aid to erect schools is refused, unless the locality provides an eligible site, rent free, contributes one-third of the entire cost of the fabric and fittings, and, then, vests the property in the Commissioners, in their Corporate capacity. Further, they generously offer to accept the transfer of the Leases and Trusts of all schools erected *before* 1845, the consideration tendered being to keep them in repair. In the case of all schools vested since 1845, the board claims the right to appoint the patron, this being the clear object of the serious change then introduced. Local Model Schools, another innovation upon Lord Stanley's scheme, which contemplated a *central* Model School only, were, at the same time, introduced, and thus the Corporation laid the foundation of the monopoly which, if unchecked, would, in a few years, place the entire control of education in the hands of a Protestant Government. The Queen's Colleges were established, the system of Model Schools introduced, and the *property* in the school fabrics handed over to the new Corporation, at the same period, so that all we now want is Intermediate Schools, and, as the Lord Chancellor states, the Imperial scheme is com-

plete. The only portrait in the National School books is that of the Queen; the only symbol on them that of the Crown; the only subjects excluded from their contents are Ireland and the Catholic Church; it needs but the official herald's art to devise the educational livery from the simple collar of the Monitor, in the village school, to the ornate robes of the Minister of Public Instruction.

The Catholic Hierarchy, Sir, at once reclaimed against, and resisted this invasion and usurpation of local rights, on the part of the Heads of the new Charter Schools. In 1847, the Bishops condemned this aggression; again, at the Council of Thurles, in 1850, so that in their recent Pastoral they but reiterate their previous condemnation of this dangerous scheme.

The last of the Resolutions of the Prelates, now to be noticed, is that which refers to the Constitution of the Commission. The only Census of Population, by Religious Persuasions, taken in Ireland, was that in 1834; and, assuming that the relative proportion of the several denominations remains unaltered, the Population of Ireland stands thus:—

Catholics	4,854,780
Established Church	643,456
Presbyterians	485,264
Dissenters	16,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,000,000</b>

The Last Report of the National Board (1857) returns the gross number of pupils who had passed under instruction, in the National Schools, in the year 1857, as 776,473, or rather over *one-eighth* of the entire population. A recent Parliamentary Return (Mr. Monsell's) gives the proportion of pupils of different creeds, so that, distributing those pupils, in the same proportion, we find that there are in the entire of the 5,335 National Schools:—

	<b>Pupils.</b>
Catholics	656,120
Presbyterians	77,647
Established Church	39,600
Dissenters	3,106
<b>Total</b>	<b>776,473</b>

The following comparison of the proportion of the numbers of the several religious persuasions, in the general population, with the proportion of the numbers of the several religious persuasions, amongst the pupils in the National Schools, shows that, although not necessarily in the *same* schools, there is full representation of all non-Catholic Persuasions in the *aggregate* of schools connected with the National Board:—

Religious Persuasion.	Proportion in each 1,000 of the	
	General Population.	Pupils in Nat. Schools.
Catholics	809	845
Established Church	81	100
Presbyterians	107	51
Dissenters	3	4

\*This Table was inaccurate in the original Letter; the items are now correct.



The Protestant Dissenters have, above their full proportion of pupils, 3 in 1,000; the Established Church have somewhat less than half of their's, or 51 in 1,000; the Presbyterians exceed their's by one-fourth, or, instead of 81, fully 100 in 1,000; and Catholics have 845, or 36 in 1,000, among the pupils of the National Schools, more than their proportion in the General Population.

The next religious element, in importance, after the pupils, is that of the Teachers, whose creeds may be thus exhibited:—

Teachers.			Proportion for 1,000.	
Catholics . . . .	7,408		113	805
Presbyterians . . .	1,142	} 1,799	79	195
Established Church .	578		3	
Dissenters . . . .	79			
Total . . . . .	9,207			1,000

Of the 5,335 National Schools, 341 only are under *Joint* or *Mixed* Patrons, and these few consist chiefly of Workhouse Schools, under Boards of Guardians, and of Model Schools, under the Commissioners of National Education. At the Lords' Inquiry, in 1854, the Earl of Derby was astounded, on learning that, after 23 years' trial of the *united* system, there were only 48 Ordinary Schools under *united* or *joint* Management, and still more, on learning, from Mr. Cross, that these 48 Schools gave so much trouble, owing to contention between the Patrons, that should the number of such schools, unfortunately, increase, the administration of the system could not be carried on. The 4,994 Schools, under *single*, or *individual* Managers, are thus classed, as to the creed of the Patrons.

		Schools.	Proportion per 1,000.	
Under Catholic Patrons . . . .		3,683	137	737
„ Presbyterians . . . . 688	} 1,311	1,311	120	263
„ Established Church . . . 597			6	
„ Dissenters . . . . . 26				
Total . . . . .		4,994		1000

The Catholic Patrons are at the rate of five Clerical to one lay Patron; the Presbyterians, nine Clerical to five lay Patrons; the Established Church,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  lay, to one Clerical Patron; and the Dissenters, six lay to one Clerical Patron. This statement, Sir, must make it clear to you that the declaration of the Catholic Prelates finally decides the fate of the so-called National System, as no less than 3,385, or 68 per cent. of the Schools are under the control of Catholic *clergymen*.

The statistical summaries, now set forth, as to the Religious Census of the whole Nation, of the pupils in the National Schools, of their Teachers, and of the Management of the Schools, were necessary, in order to enable you to understand the monstrous injustice of the Constitution of the Com-

mission. The number of attendances at Meetings by the Members in three years, ending July, 1858, are as follows :—

	No. of Commissioners.	No. of attendances at Meetings.
Catholics . . . . .	6	240
Established Church . . . . .	6} 9	811}
Presbyterians and Unitarians . . . . .	3}	318} 1,129
Total . . . . .	15	1,369

The Catholic pupils constitute upwards of *four-fifths* of the pupils ; the Catholic Commissioners only *two-fifths* of the Board, but make less than *one-fifth* in the attendances at the meetings. Lord Bellew attends one Meeting, out of each 100 ; Sir T. Redington, 4 ; Sergeant O'Hagan, 7 ; Very Rev. Dean Meyler and Master Murphy, 8 each ; and Mr. O'Ferrall, 15, out of every 100 meetings. The Resident Commissioner attended 579, out of 584 Meetings ; the three Presbyterians made 348 attendances, the six Catholics 240 ; and out of the 1,369 gross attendances made by all the Commissioners, the four Belfast gentlemen made 897 of them. Some of the Catholic Commissioners know nothing, others care nothing, others are too perverse to try and learn anything, of the System which they are supposed to administer. One and all, they have lost the confidence of the Catholic Body, having neglected and abused one of the highest trusts which could be committed to men. Either they took active part in the subversion of the system in 1840, and 1847, or, when they learned that it had taken place, they never protested against it. They authorise the largest scheme of proselytising the children of the Catholic poor, and suppress and mutilate the Reports which would expose it. They left Mrs. Ridley in Ballindine, and leave Rev. Mr. Prentice in their Belfast Model School, to traffic in souls not less precious in their Maker's eyes than those of Catholic Commissioners. They are "enemies to the Cross of Christ," and deprive of state aid the poor Nuns in Cabra, in Kells, in Goresbridge, in Drogheda, and the Teachers in Phisboro', who inculcate the doctrine and practice, as to the "Sign of the Cross," which is as ancient as the Apostles. They prohibit grants to those good men, the Christian Brothers, who impart the best education afforded in Ireland. Catholic Commissioners invade the very episcopal seats in Derry, Cork, Sligo, and Enniscorthy, there to erect State Schools in open contempt of the authority of the Bishops of those Sees. Such men, Sir, can be of no use to you, at this crisis. That Catholics could be found to remain on the Board, after the recent solemn and unanimous condemnation of the System, but increases the hostility of healthy Catholic opinion against the whole scheme. However estimable their personal character, the Catholic Members of the National Board are, this day, in the position of "false brethren," and in an attitude of opposition to the whole Episcopacy of the Catholic Church, in Ireland.

The Catholic Hierarchy justly, therefore, condemns the Constitution of the Commission. A Scotch Presbyterian Minister was taken out of his

little Academy on Ormond Quay, and, from 1831 to 1839, and charged with the duties of sole Resident Commissioner, the Professorship of Education, and the Authorship and compilation of the Books for the Catholic millions of Ireland. The chief Clerk in your office, Sir, a Scot in blood, an Englishman in education and feeling, and a Protestant in creed, to which his family had only recently conformed—was appointed his successor, and thus, for 28 years, has the chief direction of the system been confided to anti-Catholic and alien hands. To the Resident Commissioner is entrusted the selection of the Inspectors and Chief Officers, and Ulster, the Queen's Colleges, and apostates enjoy a monopoly of his patronage. A Parliamentary Return, ordered through Mr. Monsell, shows that of 117 officers stated as having £100 a year, or upwards, 29, or one-fourth of them, are natives of Antrim, Down, and Derry, and these enjoy £10,000 a-year, or nearly half of the aggregate salaries, which amount to £24,000. The Resident Commissioner's own county, Antrim, supplies 5 of the 15 Commissioners, the sole Chief of Inspection (for the past four years,) 2 of the 6 Head Inspectors, the Chief Agricultural Inspector, and 8 of the 60 District Inspectors. England and Scotland supply seven officers, who enjoy joint salaries of £2,650 a-year, whilst the province of Connaught is represented by three officers; one, an apostate, who is one of the chief clerks; one, a Presbyterian; and one, a Catholic, who is an inspector of the lowest rank, with £275 per annum, and even he is a Queen's College man. If time permitted, Sir, I would lay before you numerous examples of official corruption, and of public depravity, parallels for which you might, in vain, seek amongst the darkest records of the Civil Service. The grounds in Marlborough-street, and the closets of Tyrone House, are public marts, where a trade is driven scarcely less revolting than that in the auction saloons of the Carolinas; two articles only never obtain a bid, much less a buyer—genuine Catholicity, and pure patriotism. Whatever cause may be assigned for the failure of the Queen's Colleges, whether the Religious Revivals, or the want of Grammar Schools, it is certain that it is not the fault of Tyrone House that Sir Robert Kane had only one solitary student to present, last week, for the degree of B.A., as the National Board showers its Inspectorships, and other lucrative offices, upon his *alumni*, from whom it does not exact even correct orthography, but leaves them to learn to spell from the young urchins in the National Schools, over which they are placed.

I have now, Sir, considered, *seriatim*, all the Resolutions in the Pastoral of the Catholic Hierarchy, proving, beyond the power of dispute that they are an *under-statement* of the evils and abuses to which they refer, and I shall next address myself, in the brief space open to me, to the only remedy which will satisfy the religious conscience of Catholics, in this grave matter.

To remedy the evils, pointed out in their Resolutions, the Catholic Bishops demand the extension to Ireland of the British, or Denominational System. They suggest no untried scheme; they propose no new theory; they ask for nothing for Catholics that has not already been granted to members of every phase of Christianity, to Jews, to Mahometans, and even to Heathens. The Denominational System has been in operation in



Great Britain since 1839, and, under it, since 1849, Catholics have accepted grants. The Denominational System exists in the two Canadas, in Newfoundland, in Australia, Tasmania, and India, where Mahommedan and Heathen Schools enjoy, free from religious interference, the grants-in-aid voted for Separate Education. Some years since, the Church Education Society, in Ireland, took steps towards affiliating themselves with the British system, in order to share in the aid which it affords. Under the British Denominational System, Catholics have secured to them absolute Episcopal control in all religious matters; freedom, as to the choice of Books; freedom as to the choice of Teachers, subject, however, to examination as to literary fitness; freedom, as to the Training of their own Teachers; security, that there shall be none but Catholic Inspection; Episcopal veto, to exclude, at any time, even Catholic Inspectors, if disapproved; and security, as to the property in School sites, and the fabrics raised on them, the only condition imposed being the right of State supervision, to see that a fair amount of secular, or literary instruction is successfully imparted, and that a certain proportion of local funds shall be raised and expended, upon the Teaching Staff and upon the material wants of the School. The great religious bodies in England, Wales, and Scotland—the Established Church, Dissenters, Catholics, Jews, Established Church of Scotland, the Free Church of Scotland, and the Protestant Episcopal Church—all accept aid under the Denominational System. It is beyond the power of any Government to continue to refuse, upon grounds either of principle or of expediency, the demand to have the same system extended to Ireland. The Mixed System has been tried, and with invariable failure, throughout all the British Colonies. It has failed in the United States, failed in Germany, failed in Austria, failed in Belgium. France grants aid to separate Schools, for her small Protestant population, and the Lutherans and Calvinists of Hungary enjoy absolute control over their own Schools in the Catholic Empire of Austria. The demand made by the Catholic Hierarchy, is not on the part of a minority, but on behalf of upwards of five of nearly *six* millions of the Irish Nation. It is a demand made, not for one, of two *untried* Systems, but, one system having been tried for *forty years* with results, such as to render it revolting to religious conscience, and dangerous to civil liberty, another *tried* System is asked, as that alone under which Catholics can receive a safe education.

The change demanded is not, Sir, a change of administration, but a radical change of system. It is not a change of captain and crew, but a change of ship. No amount of nautical science, no skill in seamanship could induce Catholics to again venture in a crazy bark, in which they have been so often wrecked, that the underwriters would not insure her, and which those navigators in whom they implicitly confide pronounce to be not sea-worthy. I can scarcely credit, therefore, that you should, Sir, so totally misunderstand the nature of the demand made by Catholics, as to propose, as is reported, that the present Resident Commissioner should withdraw to the Glens of Antrim, on his full salary—to which I make no objection—and that some Catholic Barrister should occupy Tyrone

House, as his successor. It is to the *System*, Sir, that we mainly object, and not alone to its administration. Can a lay Catholic, because he gets £1,000 a year, remove the gravest evils, which a Catholic Archbishop, a Catholic Bishop, a Catholic Dean, and seven Catholic gentlemen of station, in 28 years, failed to prevent? While tens of thousands of Catholic children are being proselytised, in Protestant National Schools, what is it to the Catholic body who occupies Tyrone House? While nearly 100,000 Catholic children are deprived of the right to receive Religious Instruction in National Schools save from Protestants, what does it concern Catholics whether the £1,000 goes into the pocket of a Macdonnell or of a Kavanagh? The Earl of Derby, so late as March 1858, thus deplored the subversion of the system founded by himself:—

“I regret that in so large a portion of the schools, support has been given to the arguments of those [Protestants] opposed to them, and that, in fact, *in the great bulk of the schools, contrary to the intention of those who originally proposed the System*, there not only is no Religious Instruction given, but no facilities even are given for Separate Religious Instruction, by the *Ministers* of different persuasions, out of school hours.”

In the face of the Resolutions of the Presbyterian General Assembly, and of the Church Education Society, be so good, Sir, as to point out how the nomination of the whole of the Catholic Episcopacy upon the Board could restore Lord Stanley's original system, without driving out every Protestant from its ranks. All these attempts to meet the difficulty are idle; *the system falls*. Granted, even, that it were possible to restore the original System, from experience of the past, it is clear that Catholics could never accept such a scheme. The Catholic Prelates and the Government have, therefore, but a single issue to determine. You either concede or refuse the extension of the British System to Ireland. If you concede it, which I earnestly hope, already the Schools are practically denominational throughout three of the provinces, and in these it will necessitate little change. In Ulster the Schools are largely mixed, as to the creed of the pupils, and there only would much change be necessary. If you refuse, the Bishops have the following means of coercion open to them:—

1. *Immediate* withdrawal of all Catholic Teachers, by direction of the Patrons of their Schools, from the Central Training Department, and of Catholic Pupil-Teachers from the District Model Schools.

2. *Immediate* withdrawal of all Catholic Pupils from the Central Model, and from every Model School in Ireland, under the direct control of the Board.

3. Withdrawal of Catholic Pupils from all Schools under non-Catholic Management.

These three measures do not involve the loss of one shilling to Catholic Patrons, Teachers, or Pupils, nor the cessation of connection with the Board.

4. Catholic *parents* to instruct their children not to answer, speak to, or hold intercourse with Protestant Inspectors in the School.

5. Introduction of some simple and uniform Catholic practice in the Schools, such as the hourly use of the Sign of the Cross, with a short mental prayer, as practised by the Christian Brothers, or of any Catholic symbol.

6. General withdrawal of all the Schools from under the Board, *as a final measure.*

The political agencies by which your Government would be compelled to grant the demands of the Prelates are simple—

1. Parochial and County Meetings.
2. The Press and Public Lectures.
3. Petitions.
4. A Central Organization in Dublin.
5. Solemn pledge by the Catholic and Liberal Voters, in every parish and Town, to vote against every Candidate who will not use all legitimate opportunities to eject from Office *any* and *every* Ministry that refuses to concede Free Catholic Education.

At this solemn moment I declare, before the assembled Bishops of my Church, before my country, and the Government, my deep conviction, that the acceptance of any terms other than Denominational Grants, would be perilous to Catholic interests, and would bring future pain and sorrow to those who would be parties to such acceptance. In accepting the British System, Catholics would accept its *principle* only, and could accommodate its details to the circumstances of the country.

If I have, Sir, in any degree, thrown new light upon, or in any way simplified, Catholic demands, so far as it is open to any one to read them, in the Resolutions of the Catholic Hierarchy, I shall feel no regret at having taken the liberty, and done myself the honour of addressing these hastily drawn up letters to you. For the statements and opinions in them I alone am responsible, as no person, lay or clerical, has suggested their preparation, or offered any advice as to their matter.—I have the honour to remain, Sir, your most obedient servant,

JAMES W. KAVANAGH.

19th October, 1859.





3 0112 061941461

*In the Press,*

PEOPLE'S EDITION

OF

“THE CATHOLIC CASE STATED

OR,

PRINCIPLES, WORKING, AND RESULTS OF THE NATIONAL  
SYSTEM OF EDUCATION IN IRELAND”.

*In Ten Weekly Parts, at 4d. each.*

---

“THE CATHOLIC CASE,

AND ITS

CATHOLIC ADVOCATE

VINDICATED”.

BEING A REPLY TO PUBLICATIONS BY

THE NATIONAL BOARD,

IN REFERENCE TO THAT WORK.

*Price One Shilling.*

---

“ARITHMETIC;

ITS

PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE”.

*Fifth Edition. Price Two Shillings.*

On the Privy Council List, in England; used in the Catholic University, and in the  
Catholic Colleges and Schools of Ireland and of the Colonies.